LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
1800

The Hon.
J. Wilson
with the compliments
and best regards
of J. S. M. Curry.

Engd by H.B. Hall's Sons, New York.

HON. WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE.

BY

J. L. M. CURRY, LL. D.,

Author of "Constitutional Government in Spain."

RICHMOND:
B. F. JOHNSON & CO., PUBLISHERS,
1891.

DA563
.C8

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1891, by J. L. M. CURRY, in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

By transfer
OCT 22 1913

TO THE

Hon. Robert C. Winthrop,

I DEDICATE

THIS LITTLE BOOK

AS A MARK OF ADMIRATION FOR HIS PERSONAL VIRTUES,
FOR HIS DISTINGUISHED AND BENEFICIAL SERVICES
IN SO MANY POSITIONS, AND IN GRATITUDE FOR
HIS HELPFUL CONFIDENCE AND FRIENDSHIP.

PREFACE.

In the preparation of this volume I have sought to gather material from many authentic sources, but I must gratefully acknowledge my special indebtedness to the *Life of Gladstone* by George Barnett Smith. Facts and language I have liberally borrowed, and without burdening my pages with frequent citations I prefer to refer to the book as the most complete and valuable account of the life of Mr. Gladstone, up to 1883, that has come to my knowledge.

Mr. Gladstone's speeches and writings have been used freely as furnishing the most accurate data and the most trustworthy statement of his opinions, purposes, and motives. Instead of paraphrase or abridgement, it has seemed to me best to let him, very often, speak for himself.

As this book is a study rather than a biography, I have not observed a chronological order, nor have I sought to disguise my admiration for the subject, my sympathy gene-

rally with the Liberal party, nor my leanings on economic questions which bear on the proper policy of our government.

Because of our close relationship with Great Britain, and of the common duties and responsibilities of the two governments and peoples, I venture to hope that this sketch may not be unprofitable to thoughtful American readers, and that whatever influence it may exert will tend to strengthen the bonds of confidence and affection between the two great English-speaking nations.

Prime Ministers, 1834—1890.

Sir Robert Peel, ...	Dec. 26, 1834—April 18, 1835.
Lord Melbourne, . . .	April 18, 1835—Sept. 6, 1841.
Sir Robert Peel, ...	Sept. 6, 1841—July 6, 1846.
Lord John Russell, . . .	July 6, 1846—Feb. 21, 1852.
Lord Derby, ...	Feb. 27, 1852—Dec. 17, 1852.
Earl of Aberdeen, . . .	Dec. 28, 1852—Jan. 30, 1855.
Lord Palmerston, . . .	Feb. 3, 1855—Feb. 20, 1858.
Lord Derby, ...	Feb. 25, 1858—June 11, 1859.
Lord Palmerston, . . .	June 18, 1859—Oct. 18, 1865.
Lord John Russell, . . .	Nov. 6, 1865—June 26, 1866.
Lord Derby, ...	July 6, 1866—Feb. 25, 1868.
B. Disraeli, ...	Feb. 29, 1868—Dec. 2, 1868.
W. E. Gladstone, . . .	Dec. 9, 1868—Feb. 17, 1874.
Earl Beaconsfield, . . .	Feb. 21, 1874—April 21, 1880.
Gladstone, ...	April 28, 1880—June 9, 1885.
Earl Iddesleigh, ...	June 24, 1885—Feb., 1886.
Gladstone, ...	Feb., 1886—June, 1886.
Lord Salisbury, ...	August, 1886.

In Sir Robert Peel's first ministry, Mr. Gladstone was Under-Secretary for the Colonies; in his second ministry, Mr. Gladstone was, for a part of the time, President of the Board of Trade.

In Aberdeen's, Palmerston's, Russell's second, and his own first and second ministries, Mr. Gladstone was Chancellor of the Exchequer. For a portion of the time of his first and second ministries he devolved the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer on Sir Robert Lowe and Mr. Childers.

CONTENTS.

Chapter.		Page.
I.	Birth and Early Environments . . .	9
II.	Early Parliamentary Life — Reform Bill of 1832—Corn Laws—Navigation Laws—Neapolitan Controversy . .	16
III.	Transition Period — Change of Opinions and Parties—Disestablishment of Irish Church—Recognition of Confederacy	36
IV.	Character of the English Government—The Constitution—The Cabinet — The Prime Minister	62
V.	Chancellor of the Exchequer—Financial Policy	84
VI.	Statesmanship — Paper Duty — Purchase of Commissions in the Army . .	106
VII.	Franchise Bill—Distribution—Other Electoral Reforms	116
VIII.	Foreign Affairs	133
IX.	The House of Lords	140
X.	The Irish Question — Land Tenure—Home Rule	146
XI.	Authorship—Homeric Writings — The Vatican Decrees	183
XII.	Character, Conduct, and Opinions as Related to Religion and the Church .	191
XIII.	Gladstone and the United States . .	213
XIV.	Personal Characteristics	224

William Ewart Gladstone.

CHAPTER I.

The roll of English-speaking statesmen bears no name more illustrious than that of William Ewart Gladstone. No other civilian in this century has awakened such popular enthusiasm, has commanded such zealous following, has been identified with so many and such great measures. During this century Great Britain has undergone marvelous changes in overthrow of abuses, in removal or modification of vested rights, in enlargement of popular liberties. Progress in material growth, in inventions, in science, in discovery, in religious activities, in civil and religious freedom, in humanitarian reform, in international ethics, in the science of politics, has been very striking. There have been struggles, on which were

staked vital interests of the human race, the result of which has shown a perceptible advance toward popular freedom and human equality. In the last sixty years the statute books of England are luminous with laws which illustrate growth and liberty, and which, recited by their titles, make a monument more lasting than brass. The slave-trade has been abolished and slaves have been peaceably emancipated in the West Indies; Corporation and Test acts have been repealed and the universities liberalized; Roman Catholics and Jews have been relieved of civil disabilities; the criminal code has been humanized, death penalties have been restricted and the light of day has been let in upon prisons; three Reform bills have been carried extending the franchise and equalizing representation; the monopoly of the East India Company has been overthrown, and municipal corporations reformed; chancery and common-law courts have been made accessible to suitors, poor laws improved, game laws

modified; the Corn laws have been repealed, removing the tax from the nation's bread; liberal commercial treaties have been negotiated; the post-office has been made subservient to all who can raise a penny for a letter, or a shilling for the savings bank; a system of public education has been established, and the administration of the government is being gradually brought into more perfect harmony with popular representation. Events, revolutions, epochs, great movements in thought and action, are usually represented by individual men. For sixty years Gladstone has been a prominent actor in English politics. For near forty years his history has been the history of the House of Commons, almost of the government of Great Britain.

He was born in Liverpool on the 29th of December, 1809, and sprang from honorable parentage of that middle class which by foresight, pluck, honesty and energy, has contributed so much to England's renown and prosperity. In 1865 he said, "the blood which runs in my veins is

exclusively Scottish." From father and mother he inherited the moral and intellectual traits which he has exhibited through life, his political and ecclesiastical bias and affiliations; and they were fortunately able to give him that continuous training which made it possible for him to begin his life work, undistracted by business cares and occupations, and with powers and faculties so developed and improved that he needed no long apprenticeship to mature and qualify for legislative usefulness and influential position.

Eton College, which he entered in 1821 and left in 1827, was cramped by that conservative system of education and discipline which so long kept higher institutions enslaved by a narrow mediæval curriculum. In 1831 he matriculated in Christ Church, Oxford, "the most aristocratic of the colleges," where he attained the highest honors of the university, graduating double first. His university life attached him more strongly to conservatism in politics and religion, and re-

tarded his emergence from Tory and High Church exclusivism to clearer and healthier Liberalism. Oxford, which Morley characterizes as "that famous home of so many bad causes," has been pre-eminent in resisting educational, political and ecclesiastical reform, and has magnified the royal prerogative, preached passive obedience, and sentenced to the flames the works of modern constitutionalists. "The atmosphere of Oxford was unfavorable to liberty and gave bias to intolerance and bigotry."

On the day of Russell's execution, Oxford, in full convocation, passed a decree, promulgating, on pain of infamy here and damnation hereafter, the doctrines of divine right and passive obedience, and anathematizing twenty-seven propositions from Milton, Baxter, Godwin, Bellarmine, Buchanan, and Hobbes, as seditious, scandalous, impious, blasphemous, heretical and damnable. Macaulay, in the Edinburgh *Review*, in 1835, said, "the glory of being farther behind the age than any other class of British people is one

which the University of Oxford acquired early and has never lost."

In 1878, Gladstone made this confession: "I trace in the education of Oxford of my own time one great defect. Perhaps, it was my own fault; but I must admit that I did not learn, when at Oxford, that which I have learned since, viz., to set a due value on the imperishable and inestimable principles of human liberty. The temper, which, I think, prevailed too much in academic circles, was that liberty was regarded with jealousy, and fear could not be wholly dispensed with." Such forebodings and fears, distrust of the people, adherence to prescription, slavery to usage and prejudice, long fettered his intellect and opinions, notwithstanding his varied scholarship, the solidity of his understanding and his innate love of investigation. Because of home and academic training the young man found his intimate associates and party affiliations among Tories and High Churchmen. His father being the most rigid of Tories, home, school and church

tended to keep the son under the sway of tradition and authority. Thus, home life, social forces, personal friendships, the potencies of college influence, combined to put the early career on the trend directly adverse to what manhood and old age have wrought. On the other hand, the father's strength of will, business integrity, large experience, honorable acquaintanceship, commercial connections, the mother's gentleness, conscientiousness and susceptibility to impressions, the scholarly tastes and love of letters with which his mind had been early imbued, the refined and cultured society of the university, the early practice of composition and of debate, the habit of observation and widening of sympathies and of intelligence produced by travel, combined to fit him, in an unusual degree, for his subsequent life.

CHAPTER II.

When Lord Grey took up the subject of parliamentary reform in 1793, he offered to prove that séventy peers, by direct nomination or influence, returned 153 members, and ninety-one commoners returned 139 members; or that in England and Wales (exclusive of Scotland) 302 members, a majority of the House of Commons, were returned by 162 persons. Charles James Fox made a strong speech in favor of Grey's motion, feeling that, in the distressed condition of affairs, giving the people a larger share in the government would inspire the nation with increased confidence. So great was the dread caused by the French Revolution, and such was the reluctance of the higher classes to part with power, that these attempts at reform were voted down for over thirty years.

The fraud and mockery of borough elections, "the vile machinery of openly-

marketable votes," the increase of intelligence and property among the disfranchised, exasperation at exclusion from political rights, had slowly weaned the people from their ancient attachments, and the wisest statesmen saw the need of amending the system of representation and of making concessions to the increasing popular demand. What Grey had exposed and condemned, near forty years before, remained unreformed evils. Old Sarum, Gatton, Ludgershall, with few or no electors, had members in Parliament. Public opinion was hardly an element in the choice of constituencies. Two-thirds of the House of Commons was made up of the nominees of peers or landlords. One duke returned eleven members. Seats were openly bought and sold. Populous towns, such as Manchester and Birmingham, were without representation. England became profoundly agitated. In 1831, Earl Grey brought in a bill for reform, which was debated with great ability for seven weeks by the House of Commons and rejected by a

majority of eight. The ministers immediately tendered their resignations, but the King (William IV), who was in favor of reform, refused to accept them, and dissolved the Parliament. The people, to whom the question was referred, returned a majority favorable to the measure. A new bill was discussed for near three months, and passed by a majority of 109. The House of Lords rejected. The nation was greatly stirred. Petitions poured in upon Parliament. The feeling became violent and expressed itself in language like this : the measure must be carried through Parliament or over Parliament. Public meetings were held in all parts of the kingdom. Riots occurred in some of the large towns. Some of the most unpopular lords were assaulted in the streets ; others were burned in effigy. There was a resolute determination that reform should be carried. In satire of the vain efforts of the Lords to resist the popular will, Sydney Smith, the witty Whig preacher, used his well-known illustration of Mrs.

Partington trundling her mop and vigorously pushing back the Atlantic ocean. During the debate Sir James Mackintosh, in the House of Commons, and Chancellor Brougham, in the House of Lords, made their celebrated speeches, which have since served as text-books for all students of the question. The bill was introduced for the third time and passed by a majority of 162, but the Lords rejected it by a majority of 39. The ministry instantly resigned, but the King invited them back on the condition that he would create enough new lords to carry the bill. To escape such a humiliation many of the opposing lords absented themselves, and reform was passed by the upper House by a vote of 105 to 22. The aristocracy tried to persuade the King to withhold his assent to the measures, but it became a law on the 7th of June, 1832, the King approving by royal commissioners. A great victory was won, and a fruitful change was made in the constitution. It is singular that the judgment of good and enlight-

ened men can be so perverted as to make them oppose the welfare and progress of the country, and to convert them into the enemies of the people. As a singular illustration of how class feeling and special prerogatives may pervert minds and consciences, it may be stated that in 1818 almost the whole bench of English bishops opposed Sir Samuel Romilly in his effort to induce Parliament to abolish capital punishment for stealing to the value of four shillings from shops. The Duke of Wellington, whose devotion to his country no one could question, said he had not heard of any measure "by which the state of representation could be improved, or placed on a footing more satisfactory to the people. * * * I am thoroughly convinced that England possesses at this moment a legislature which answers all the good purposes of a legislature in a higher degree than any scheme of government whatever has been found to do in any country in the world."

The Reform law disappointed the vaticinations of those who saw in it insecu-

rity of property and overthrow of the crown. As happened in 1885, the Reformed House of Commons did not show such an alteration in the composition of the body as was anticipated. Among the new members was Mr. Gladstone, who, on the invitation of the Duke of Newcastle, contested the borough of Newark, and was returned at the head of the poll. At the early age of twenty-two he began his parliamentary career, the most remarkable in the history of free government.

The first Parliament under the Reform act met on the 29th of January, 1833. Two important measures were passed. The commercial monopoly of the East India Company was abolished, and the trade to the East was thrown open to all merchants. Slavery in the British colonies was abolished, and the owners of the negroes were paid £20,000,000 for their property. It was on a side issue, or an incidental question growing out of the slavery legislation, that Mr. Gladstone made his maiden speech. On three

other occasions he spoke during the year. He did not oppose abolition, regarding "the state of slavery as an evil and a demoralizing state," but he defended the slave-owners, among whom was his father, against charges of cruelty brought against them, and favored apprenticeship as being less hurtful than immediate emancipation. His position has been much misrepresented, but his predictions have been singularly verified. On the principle of slavery he agreed with the Abolitionists like Clarkson and Wilberforce, but he urged the danger and unwisdom of suddenly freeing the slaves without some preparatory education and without taking some precaution to insure that they would use their freedom properly. His speeches were courageous, for in places of public worship and in social gatherings the planters were decried as moral monsters, and all who did not agree with the extremists were anathematized. These speeches gave such proofs of ability and such a prophecy of greatness that his desirableness as a minister was debated

and decided on, and Sir Robert Peel, the Prime Minister, invited him to the office of Junior Lord of the Treasury. He was soon promoted to be Under Secretary for the Colonies, where he furnished abundant proof of good business qualities. Peel's government had a short lease of power, and the Under Secretary retired with his chief. As a member of the opposition he was attentive to general legislation, participated in the debates, but avoided acrimony of controversy, and secured respect and admiration by his uniform courtesy and growing importance. In 1841 the Whig government was overthrown. The House of Commons passed a resolution that it did not possess sufficiently their confidence to enable it to carry through measures deemed essential to the public welfare, and that continuance in office under such circumstances was at variance with the spirit of the constitution. Parliament was prorogued, and a new election was ordered. This resulted in a Tory majority, and in the consequent new ministry

Mr. Gladstone received the appointment of Vice-President of the Board of Trade and Master of the Mint. His duties engrossed his mind, for in every department of public affairs to which he was called he carried indefatigable industry and an honest purpose to promote the public service. Schemes of practical legislation were devised by his busy brain, and he introduced and pushed forward, until the royal assent was obtained, bills for the abolition of restrictions on the exportation of machinery and for the improvement of railway transportation. In 1845 the ministry proposed an increase of the endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, in Ireland. This measure, being at variance with views Mr. Gladstone had uttered upon the relations of the church and the state, he was compelled by his self-respect, without, however, prejudging the question, and while retaining for his colleagues "unaltered sentiments, both of public regard and private attachment," to resign his post in the min-

istry. Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel both avowed their respect and admiration for his character and abilities. Greville says that Peel lavished praise and regrets upon him in a tone quite affectionate.

The Corn laws were the principle of protection applied to agriculture, a tax on the people's bread. Anti-Corn-Law associations were formed and afterwards merged into the Anti-Corn-Law League, which, for seven weary years, with persistency, unflagging courage and generous liberality, prosecuted the work of repeal. This was the application of free trade at once to agriculture as well as to manufactures—a principle in its application to the complicated conditions of industry and commerce which few statesmen then understood, or had taken the pains to study. Some declared it impracticable and as little likely to be accomplished as the overthrow of the monarchy; others paraded the stereotyped hobgoblin that it would imperil the union of church and state.

This extraordinary contest is an interesting chapter in the annals of England, and well illustrates the patient and almost superhuman effort required to wrest from privilege and wealth what is demanded for human liberty and happiness. The Corn-Law League was a powerful and effective organization for political action, but success would have been more difficult, if not impossible, if the agitation had not been preceded by the Reform bill of 1832. The two were correlated, mutually helpful and retroactive. Cobden was the master spirit of the movement for cheap bread, and he organized it for victory. He inspired and consolidated the scattered elements; instructed the nation, made converts of enemies and secured the co-operation of those who had the power to adopt the requisite legislation. He brought "the abstract conclusions of political economy within range of the understanding of all classes and conditions of people," and demonstrated that it was the condition of the hungry, and not the interest of a class, which cried for relief.

The Corn Law League doubtless contributed to the downfall of the Melbourne administration in 1841. Under Peel's government, repeal was defeated by a majority of 303. In June, 1845, it was again defeated by a majority of 132. Peel and Russell, the two great party leaders, having been converted to the cause, Peel brought in a bill for the repeal and carried it by a majority of nearly 100 votes. There had been no general election to produce this revolution. The same House, the same Government, the same Prime Minister, who had opposed and defeated in 1841, repealed in 1845. The repeal took full effect on 1st February, 1849.

In 1845, Mr. Gladstone published a pamphlet, *Remarks upon Recent Commercial Legislation*, in which he urged that English statesmen should use every effort to disburden of all legal charges the materials of industry, and thus enable the workman to approach his work at home on better terms. These broad views soon found expansion and practical recognition in Sir Robert Peel's recommenda-

tion of the repeal of the Corn laws. The change of opinion on the part of the premier was an act of courageous and magnanimous statesmanship, and interrupted many cherished personal and political friendships; but he had the courage of his convictions and entered upon that policy which resulted in bringing Great Britain to her present beneficial system of comparative free trade. The Corn law repeal led to a reconstruction of the Peel government, and Mr. Gladstone became Colonial Secretary in place of Lord Stanley. This acceptance of office in a ministry pledged to the repeal of the Corn laws led to his retirement from the representation of Newark, a borough under the influence of the Duke of Newcastle, an ardent protectionist. Without a seat in the house, the great minister was deprived of his powerful support there, but it is well known that he was the most advanced statesman on the free trade question in the Peel cabinet, and that he was a most efficient ally of Cobden and Peel in finally sweeping from the statute

book the obnoxious laws. When the Tory government of Lord Stanley (then Lord Derby) came into power in 1852, an effort was made to return to the protectionist policy, but, after the appeal to the country, Disraeli, the leader of the government in the House of Commons, found it necessary not to attempt to interfere with the repeal.

Free trade, as a theory of politics, followed to its logical consequences, required the throwing open of the whole navigation of the country, of every sort and description. Commerce is the life of Great Britain. Whatever stands in the way of supplying the markets of the world with her products must be gotten rid of, if possible. It is needful to clear herself of everything that obstructs the success of the extension of manufactures and commerce. Foreign trade could not be secured or permanently preserved were she to persevere in restrictive laws and in seeking to build herself up by avoidance of generous, manly competition. In 1849, the proposition of the

government for the repeal of the navigation laws had in Mr. Gladstone an earnest advocate. England abolished her restrictive navigation laws, and, to secure the world's carrying trade, repealed all her prohibitory statutes and permitted her merchants to supply themselves with ships wherewith to carry on their business from any source from which ships could be obtained with advantage. The coasting trade of Great Britain is also open to all nations. These relaxations have been so beneficial that England is now the first nation in shipping and commerce. It was predicted that freeing her trade and ships would be the destruction of the wooden walls of old England and her reduction to the rank of a third-rate power. The result has been greatly augmented prosperity. In 1840 the tonnage of Great Britain was 6,490,000 tons; in 1889 it had risen to 52,469,654 tons. In 1888 she owned seven-twelfths of the world's shipping and 70 per cent. of the world's tonnage, and her sailing fleet, numbering 15,025 vessels and represent-

ing over 3,000,000 tons, was the largest in the world.

In the winter of 1850–'51 occurred an episode in Mr. Gladstone's life which had a marked effect on his political views and party connections, on public opinion in Europe, and the development of nationality in Italy. Ferdinand, King of Naples, by an arbitrary exercise of power, had banished or imprisoned a number of persons who were of the opposition in the Chamber of Deputies. In addition to these deputies fully 20,000 political prisoners had been thrown into crowded and loathsome dungeons in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Mr. Gladstone, residing temporarily in Naples, had his attention called to this scandal and tyranny, and he set himself to work to ascertain the truth of the rumors and accusations. Becoming thoroughly satisfied, he felt impelled to attempt a release of the prisoners, or a modification of the harshness of the confinement, as well as a redress of the evils which were a scandal to civilization. He addressed

two letters, which passed through many editions, to the Earl of Aberdeen, on the state prosecutions of the Neapolitan government, in which he held up to public view the outrages perpetrated by the government "upon religion, upon civilization, upon humanity, and upon decency." In language which sent a thrill of horror and indignation through Europe and America, he alleged a "deliberate, systematic violation of the law by the power appointed to watch over and maintain it." "It is such violation of human and written law as this, carried on for the purpose of violating every other law, unwritten and eternal, human and divine; it is the wholesale persecution of virtue when united with intelligence, operating upon such a scale that entire classes may with truth be said to be its object, so that the government is in bitter and cruel, as well as utterly illegal, hostility to whatever in the nation really lives and moves and forms the mainspring of practical progress and improvement; it is the awful profana-

tion of public religion, by its notorious alliance, in the governing powers, with the violation of every moral law under the stimulants of fear and vengeance; it is the perfect prostitution of the judicial office, which has made it, under veils only too threadbare and transparent, the degraded recipient of the vilest and clumsiest forgeries, got up wilfully and deliberately by the immediate advisers of the crown for the purpose of destroying the peace, the freedom, ay, and even, if not by capital sentences, the life of men among the most virtuous, upright, intelligent, distinguished and refined of the whole community; it is the savage and cowardly system of moral, as well as in a lower degree of physical, torture, through which the sentences extracted from the debased courts of justice are carried into effect."

Lord Palmerston sent copies of the letters to the English representatives at the various courts of Europe, to be laid before the governments, with the hope of inducing them to aid in having reformed the

evils exposed. Numerous and envenomed replies were made, but they were so weak and inconclusive as to justify a strengthening of the statements. An authorized reply by the Neapolitan government was published in the *Journal des Debats* and paid for. This official document was an appeal to the tribunal of public opinion and a tacit acknowledgment that governments, Bourbon and despotic, were responsible, not alone to the governed but to humanity as well. To this responsible antagonist Mr. Gladstone published a rejoinder, showing that the official declaration was an admission of the accuracy of nine-tenths of the letters to the Earl.

The interference was timely in its arraignment of a tyrant at the bar of law and civilization, and in bringing about redress, although too tardy. In the course of a few years the despotism fell and the Two Sicilies became a part of united Italy. A contributing cause to the unification and redemption of the classical Peninsula was the bold and unanswerable

attack made by the English statesman. Reference to the incident has been prolonged because of its conceded influence as auxiliary to the change in Italy, which is, considering the civil and ecclesiastical obstacles, among the greatest marvels of modern times. As late as 1854, Palmerston could not be persuaded that the unity of Italy was the basis for reform. Happily, Cavour, with his sagacious and masculine intellect, secured the co-operation of Garibaldi, and by "the greatest master-stroke of the last half century" secured for his country a place among the great powers of Europe, and afterwards united all Italy under one government. Cavour was the chief agent in the regeneration of his country. He was a consummate diplomatist, a great parliamentary leader, an accomplished statesman, who realized the boast of Themistocles by making a small state into a great one. He died in 1861; the consolidation was not then thoroughly completed, but he lived to see his task all but accomplished.

CHAPTER III.

As has been seen, Gladstone's Tory and High Church environments gave the bias to his early religious and political views and determined his associations and actions. Macaulay, in his review of *The State in its Relations with the Church*, properly inscribed to the University of Oxford as in its temper not alien from her own, speaks of the author as "the rising hope of the stern and unbending Tories." The strength of his youth and early manhood was given to that party, and he brought to its support affluence of diction, irrepressible energy, flowing courtesy, increasing administrative and parliamentary knowledge and skill, and sincere conscientiousness. To Sir Robert Peel he gave a loyal and able support, at times, however, evincing independence of judgment, and giving promise of what Macaulay had observed, "a laudable desire to penetrate beneath the surface of

questions, and to arrive, by long and intent meditation, at the knowledge of great general laws." Principles may be immutable, but their application is very variable, contingent on a thousand circumstances. The condition of a people may change essentially. What might be true in an ideal state of society, or with a matured government, or with strength and wealth and peace, might be very unwise or inexpedient in war, or bankruptcy, or feebleness, or immaturity, or primitiveness. With new conditions a statesman should have liberty to change his opinions. Infallibility is no more attainable in political or financial than in ecclesiastical or religious problems. The ingenuous man, conscious of increase of knowledge or wisdom, of altered circumstances, must regulate opinions and conduct accordingly. Obstinate, dogged adherence to an opinion once formed and expressed, irrespective of progress of events, of new light, and regardless of the duty to follow the leadings of truth, makes all instruction valueless, all reading and debate un-

necessary, all progress impossible. That there can never be a legitimate change in politics rests upon a fallacious assumption. "I am accused," said Mr. Gladstone, "of want of conformity in my opinions. I have not pretended to it. I have been all my life a learner, and I am so still." Instead of making a deity of former opinions, or claiming inerrability, or enslaving himself to party or to men, Gladstone has sought ever for truth, and has not been timid or self-seeking in following it. Some of his ecclesiastical and political associates saw, in his philosophical generalizations, in his earnest searching for the right, in his determination to get to the root of questions, in his independent utterances, little hope of binding him to blind tradition, or authority, or self-satisfied conservatism. Dr. Wordsworth, in 1847, abstained from supporting him as the member for the University of Oxford, because his writings appeared "to contain the germ of liberation principles and of the political equality of all religions," and he thought he

saw that Gladstone "would become a Liberal of the Liberals both upon the church and all other questions." More than once he sacrificed office to convictions of duty.

As showing transition in opinion and conviction and marking the most complete revolution of conduct and party affiliations, two or three illustrations will suffice.

(*a*) In 1841, on the hustings at Newark, Gladstone assured the electors that "there were two points upon which the British farmer might rely—the first being that adequate protection would be given him, and the second that protection would be given him through the means of the sliding scale." When, considerably against his will, he was first called to the Department of Trade, this made it necessary "to study as hard as I could," quoting his own language, "all the questions connected with our commerce, of which, down to that time, I had known little or nothing; and the effect of the study upon my mind was rapid and decisive, for it at once began to act as a powerful solv-

ent upon whatever protective ideas I had been accustomed to learn and imbibe." When the repeal of the Corn laws became a burning practical question, he bent his powers anew to the study of problems of trade and finance, and following the light of reason he co-operated vigorously with his chief. Unable to resist the arguments in favor of free trade, he boldly announced his convictions as opposed to "so-called protective laws, which fetter industry, diminish wealth, and aggravate distress." This was as complete a summersault as the great South Carolina and Massachusetts statesmen, Calhoun and Webster, made in reverse directions on the tariff.

(*b*) The change of opinion and action on church questions has been peculiar and a little inexplicable, perhaps contradictory. Retention of High Church connections, acceptance of certain exclusive dogmas and sacerdotal theories, unswerving loyalty to the Anglican Church and the establishment in England, are still the guides of legislative action, so far as pertains to England, but outside of

England, and in matters not affecting the integrity of the establishment, there have been departures from early views quite as wide and antipodal as on questions of trade and finance and popular liberty. When the establishment is not involved there is a signal elevation of view and an unusual capability of regarding ecclesiastical questions and religious differences from a broad and generous and tolerant standpoint.

The Oxford Union Society in his university days grappled with the questions which engaged the energies of maturer men. At that time Gladstone opposed the removal of Jewish disabilities. When Mr. Gladstone was a young member of Parliament the *status* of the Anglican Church in its connection with the state was undergoing an earnest discussion. Non-conformists were vigorously assaulting the national establishment and support of a single church or denomination, and demanding religious equality and liberty. In 1837 and 1838 a strong feeling had been aroused among the sup-

porters and beneficiaries of the alliance. Vested and powerful interests, as long as they prevail, never want advocates, who bring out all their powers of intellect and all the perverse precedents of history, to find out specious mitigations of their evil effects and make the worse appear the better cause. Adroit as such advocacy may be, it sometimes does not look beyond present triumph. The more conscientious or sagacious of the supporters of an antagonized policy appreciate the necessity of finding a stable basis or permanent principles on which to rest their defence. With his sincerity and his habits of investigation, Mr. Gladstone could not content himself with the common and popular theories of the union of church and state, nor with the plausible, but untenable, arguments by which it was sustained. He saw the need of more accurate definitions, of fixing the limits of governmental interference, and of meeting the objection that to tax one citizen for the support of another's religion is unjust in itself

and quite apart from the individual, social and political welfare which taxation should be designed to secure. He therefore published *The State in its Relations to the Church*, in which, as a protest against expediency doctrines, he set himself to prove that the state ought to have a religion, to be religious, and to teach religious truth to all its subjects, and that the state should do nothing without reference to the Divine will. It is but just to give his reasons for supporting the establishment.

"Because the government stands with us in a paternal relation to the people, and is bound in all things to consider not merely their existing tastes, but the capabilities and ways of their improvement; because it has both an intrinsic competency and external means to amend and assist their choice; because to be in accordance with God's mind and will it must have a religion, and because to be in accordance with its conscience that religion must be the truth, as held by it under the most solemn and accumu-

lated responsibilities; because this is the only sanctifying and preserving principle of society, as well as to the individual that particular benefit without which all others are worse than valueless; we must disregard the din of political contention and the pressure of worldly and momentary motives, and in behalf of our regard to man, as well as of our allegiance to God, maintain among ourselves, where happily it still exists, the union between the church and the state."

Such a treatise, defending the union on higher grounds than it had previously been placed, elicited many comments, both favorable and adverse. The most conclusive reply, from an Englishman's point of view, was by Macaulay in the Edinburgh *Review*, and he averred that Gladstone's whole theory rested upon the fundamental proposition that the propagation of religious truth is one of the chief ends of government as government. By searching analysis, by crushing logic, by apt and copious illustrations, by unsurpassed brilliancy of style, the reviewer

combated the theory and demonstrated the fallacy of the doctrine that every association which exercises any power whatever, and especially that a civil government, is bound, as such association, to possess a religion. Mr. Gladstone, in a letter to Macaulay, disclaimed the inference that his theory or argument contemplated the process of disabling, or disqualifying for civil office, all those who did not adhere to the religion of the state, and denied that he had ever propounded the maxim *simpliciter* that an establishment was to be maintained. The object of his work, as he defined it, was "to survey the actual state of the relations between the state and the church; to show from history the ground which had been defined for the national church at the Reformation; and to inquire and determine whether the existing state of things was worth preserving and defending against encroachment from whatever quarter."

To an American, with his experience of voluntaryism and holding to the inviolability of the human conscience and that

religion is outside the sphere of civil government, and to any one regarding the New Testament as the law of Christian life and the limit of authority for Christian churches, all these arguments, *pro* and *con*, by such disputants as Macaulay and Gladstone even, seem singularly superficial and unsatisfactory, as not reaching the gist of the matter and as beginning and continuing the discussion too remote from the foundation principle—the authoritativeness of the New Testament.

In consistency with his views, during the Peel administration—August, 1841, to July, 1846—Mr. Gladstone resisted the onslaughts made upon the Irish Church, as he did the bills abolishing the University Tests, extinguishing the church rate grievances, encouraging education by Privy Council grants and removing the civil disabilities of the Jews. Gradually convictions changed and measures advancing towards perfect toleration had his active friendship. On the dissolution of the Parliament by the Queen in per-

son in 1847 a general election became necessary. The return of Baron Rothschild for the city of London provoked much controversy and drew out doleful forebodings from unprogressive Toryism. A statutory declaration "on the faith of a Christian" was required of all taking seats in the House of Commons. To remove this restriction Lord John Russell, shortly after the assembling of Parliament, proposed a resolution affirming the eligibility of Jews to all functions and offices to which Roman Catholics were admissible by law. Gladstone, in favoring the resolution, inquired wherein Jews were distinguishable from any other classes in the community. When he formerly opposed the law for the removal of Jewish disabilities he foresaw that, if municipal, magisterial and executive functions were given to the Jews, legislative functions could not any longer be refused. In case of difficulty the members would have the consolation of knowing that they had yielded to a sense of justice, and by so doing had not dispar-

aged religion or lowered Christianity, but had rather elevated both in all reflecting and well-regulated minds. The motion being carried by a large majority, Lord John subsequently moved that the House resolve itself into a committee on the oaths to be taken by members, with a view to relief. Gladstone said he would not shrink from declaring his deliberate conviction that the civil and political claims of the Jew to the discharge of civil and political duties ought not, in justice, to be barred, and could not beneficially be barred because of a difference in religion.

The lives of few men show such an advance in Liberal opinions as may be found in Mr. Gladstone. He who took such a view in 1838 of the desirableness of an establishment succeeded, a generation later, as Prime Minister, in disestablishing a branch of the church in Ireland. This change provoked animadversion and abuse far in excess of any that mere political changes had brought upon his head. To deprive incumbents of valuable privileges which were obtained with-

out labor or money, and which offered a lifetime enjoyment of comfortable ease, naturally excited ill feeling and bitter resistance. To interfere with annuities derivable from property held by the church, even though the property, hundreds of years before, came from confiscation or government grants, seems by some peculiar or perverse psychological law to awaken more bitterness than if the property had been acquired in ordinary secular transactions between man and man. Mr. Gladstone became a convert to the theory that a popular government cannot rightly maintain a religion which is opposed to the feelings and convictions of the nation, and followed his change of views by his grandest and most difficult achievement. This, like other transactions, was not sudden, for "it extended over a quarter of a century," and was in nowise due to mental eccentricity or selfish ambition. It was the logic not so much of events, of revolutions in society, as of broader principles and juster views of government and of the rights of man.

In the session of 1867 Mr. Gladstone said it was idle, it was mockery, to urge the Irish people to loyalty and union unless the words were sustained by corresponding substance. In a remarkable speech, asking justice to Ireland, he concluded by an impassioned appeal to prudent men, to chivalrous men, to compassionate men, but above all to just men, "in the name of truth and right, bearing this in mind, that when the case is proved and the hour is come, justice delayed is justice denied." This address became the "platform" of the Liberal party, and Irish Church disestablishment was accepted as the paramount issue of the approaching campaign. He soon introduced into the House of Commons a series of resolutions, the first of which was that the established Church of Ireland should cease to exist as an establishment, due regard being had "to all personal interests and to all individual rights of property." Disraeli, Stanley and other members of the government, being strongly in favor of ecclesiastical

endowments and opposed to the destruction of the Irish establishment, issue was joined, and on the 30th of March began one of those remarkable debates which have made the House of Commons the theatre of parliamentary oratory and a school of liberty. Burning the bridge behind him, Mr. Gladstone declared his opinion, in unmistakable language, that the establishment in Ireland should cease to exist, and denied that the disendowment of the Irish Church would be dangerous to the English establishment. "What was dangerous to the latter was to hold her in communion with a state of things politically dangerous and socially unjust. The church establishment, in its theory and in its aim, is beautiful and attractive, yet what is it but an appropriation of public property, an appropriation of the fruits of labor and skill to certain purposes? and unless these purposes are fulfilled that appropriation cannot be justified. What we have to do is to consider well and deeply before we take the first step in an engagement

such as this; but having entered into the controversy, there and then to acquit ourselves like men, and to use every effort to remove what still remains of the scandals and calamities in the relations which exist between England and Ireland, and to make our best efforts, at least, to fill up with the cement of human concord the whole fabric of the British empire."

The resolution was carried by a majority of 65. The government being defeated, the Parliament, the last elected under the Reform bill of 1832, was prorogued with a view to its dissolution. Writs were issued for a new Parliament, and the returns showed a decided preponderance in favor of the Liberal party. There were not fewer than 227 new members, who had not sat before. Gladstone, being summoned by the Queen, undertook to form a new ministry, which included John Bright, who thus excused his acceptance of office: "Happily he trusted that the time had come when in this country an honest man might enter the service of the crown and at the same

time not feel it in any degree necessary to dissociate himself from his own people." In 1708 Godolphin formed his government on a basis exclusively Whig; in 1868 the Whig party disappears, its membership and organization being merged in the Liberal party. With a favorable sentiment in the House of Commons and in the country, disestablishment would seem comparatively easy, only a matter of adjustment of details. Such was not the experience. Mastering details and applying them was found to be a difficult and complex problem, and despite the popular sentiment, so overwhelmingly declared in the recent election, the Tories presented an organized and incessant resistance to every stage of the measure. The undertaking, however grounded in justice and right, was the gravest of modern times. Abuses yield reluctantly. Popular grievances generally encounter the virulent opposition of the upper classes, especially of those who batten on the injustice. The establishment was interwoven with law, literature and man-

ners. It could plead a course of long observance for its continuance. Gladstone's task was such as to tax to the maximum all his patience and courage and energies. His experience paralleled Mr. Jefferson's, who said, in reference to his share in the struggle for religious liberty in Virginia, "the severest contest in which I have ever been engaged."

Public meetings, the press, the clergy, Conservatives in and out of Parliament, denounced the measure as robbery, as offensive to God, as wicked and abominable, as the greatest national sin ever committed, as perilous weakening of the foundations of property, as the entering wedge to greater wrongs, as treason to the crown. The common cry of danger to the church, awakening tragic apprehensions, such as the clergy and the universities aroused at the general election of 1705, did its accustomed service. Gladstone and his colleagues and supporters were denounced as political brigands, as enemies of the country and the church. All that inventive hate could

concoct of calumny and opprobrium was heaped upon them. On the 1st of March Mr. Gladstone, for three hours, unfolded his scheme in a speech which, for excellence of arrangement, lucidity of statement, masterly marshaling of facts, vigorous grasp of the subject, prodigious faculty of memory and thought, elasticity of genius and reliance upon lofty principle, was probably never surpassed in any deliberative assembly. Prescott, in *The Conquest of Mexico*, gives a thrilling description of the *noche triste*, or melancholy night, so branded in their national annals, when the invading Spaniards made their flight in 1520 from the city. Unlike that historic tragedy, this was a "night of justice," immortal for application of noblest ethics to human affairs, for leading an oppressed people from ecclesiastical bondage and tyranny into the light of freedom and right. Some sentences from the peroration of the luminous address will illustrate the exaltation of sentiment and fervor of patriotism of the orator.

"I do not know in what country so great a change, so great a transition, has been proposed for the ministers of a religious communion who have enjoyed for many ages the preferred position of an established church. I can well understand that to many in the Irish establishment such a change appears to be nothing less than ruin and destruction. * * * I trust when, instead of the adventitious and fictitious aid on which we have too long taught the Irish establishment to lean, it should come to place its trust in its own resources, in its own great mission, in all that it can draw from the energy of its ministers and members, and the high hopes and promises of the gospel that it teaches, it will find that it has entered upon a new era of existence, an era bright with hope and potent for good. * * This measure is in every sense a great measure, * * and great as a testing measure, for it will show for one and for all of us of what metal we are made. Upon us all it brings a great responsibility—great and foremost upon those

who occupy this bench. We are especially chargeable, nay, deeply guilty, if we have either dishonestly, as some think, or even prematurely or unwisely, challenged so gigantic an issue. * * But the responsibility, though heavy, does not exclusively press upon us; it presses upon every man who has to take part in the discussion and decision upon this bill. Every man approaches the discussion under the most solemn obligations to raise the level of his vision and expand its scope in proportion with the greatness of the matter in hand. The working of our constitutional government itself is upon its trial, for I do not believe there ever was a time when the wheels of legislative machinery were set in motion, under conditions of peace and order and constitutional regularity, to deal with a question greater or more profound. * * * For myself and my colleagues, I say we are sanguine of the issue. We believe, and for my part I am deeply convinced, that when the final consummation shall arrive, and when

the words are spoken that shall give the force of law to the work embodied in this measure—the work of peace and justice—those words will be echoed upon every shore where the name of Ireland or the name of Great Britain has been heard, and the answer to them will come back in the approving verdict of civilized mankind."

The progress of the bill was slow, encountering obstacles at every step, but on the final vote it had a majority of 114. In the House of Lords the discussion was able and eloquent. Of the bishops, only a solitary vote, that of Dr. Thirlwall, was recorded in its favor. On its final passage a protest of forty-nine peers was entered on the journal. One peer complained that the lords were humiliated and degraded; another said they were called upon to yield to the arrogant will of a single man. This intemperance of speech grew, in part, out of what was understood to be Gladstone's purpose to appeal to the royal prerogative to make a number of peers sufficient to pass the

measure in the event the Lords offered a factious and unrelenting opposition to a measure which was so indubitably demanded by the popular will. Queen Anne had created twelve peers to carry the Peace of Utrecht, and Walpole was once threatened by a like proposal of the gravest constitutional moment. When the House of Peers threw out the Reform bill, Lord Grey, who was then Prime Minister, resigned because the King would not use his prerogative so as to overcome the opposition. On the 26th of July, 1869, the Irish Church bill, which ranks alongside the Habeas Corpus act, Magna Charta, and the Right of Petition, received the assent of Queen Victoria. In 1874 Gladstone referred in strong language to the part he had taken: "I must say I do not repent the part I took. So far from repenting it, if I am to have a character with posterity at all—supposing that posterity is ever to know that such a person as myself existed in this country—I am perfectly willing that my character should be tried simply and

solely by the proceedings to which I was a party with regard to the Irish Church establishment."

(*c*) Another instance of change of opinion might be omitted, but it illustrates the ingenuous candor of the subject of this study. In 1862 Mr. Gladstone expressed his conviction that Mr. Jefferson Davis had succeeded in making the Confederate States an independent nation. In 1867 he frankly acknowledged, "I must confess that I was wrong, that I took too much upon myself in expressing such an opinion. I probably, like many Europeans, did not understand the nature and working of the American Union."

When Sir Robert Peel died, in June, 1850, the Conservative party was without a leader, and the differences which had been already manifested among the members soon developed into positive disintegration. Some of the members aligned themselves with the Tories; others, embarrassed by traditions, remained for awhile neutral, or were drawn by an elec-

tive affinity into the Liberal organization. A transfer is seldom sudden and immediate, if it come from a change of convictions. Gladstone was gradually alienated from his former associates. The precise date of his abandonment is probably undefined, even in his own consciousness. He has himself stated that he had not, so late as 1857, formally left the Tory party, but it is well known that he declined, in 1852, the earnest invitation of Lord Derby to become a member of his cabinet.

CHAPTER IV.

Classification of governments as despotic, monarchical, aristocratic or republican, is very vague and unsatisfactory. With the exception of a pure despotism, which can exist only among rude savages, all governments, in their practical administration, are complex, involving many instrumentalities and agencies and much subdivision in the effort to compound the public forces in wise and balanced action In Great Britain, the present system is the result of the slow, but not always regular, evolution of centuries, "the offspring of tendency and indeterminate time." The Cromwellian period and the Revolution of 1688 established irrevocably the most distinguishing feature of modern civilized governments, that they exist for the benefit and by the consent of the people. Divine right of kings and prescription as sources of authority are no longer rec-

ognized. Regal right is founded upon contract. A breach of that contract dissolves the allegiance of the subject. Fox said that the right of self-government in a people does not depend on precedent, or the concessions of rulers, but is founded in the nature of things. It is not because they *have* been free, but because they have a *right* to be free, that men demand their freedom. The great struggle of the eighteenth century was whether the government of the realm should be parliamentary or monarchical. It was settled in favor of a Parliament, "containing, nominating, guiding and controlling its own executive;" but a "hardly less important question turned on the mechanism by which the system could be made to work." For conducting national affairs wisely and successfully, the House of Commons proved a better instrument than the close aristocracy of the House of Lords, or than the two Houses combined, for it possessed the exclusive prerogative of introducing bills of revenue, and had an increasing representation of

those classes and interests which, under the leveling spirit of commerce and democracy, were asserting their importance and power. The House of Commons embodies "the living and social forces of the country in all their variety." To organize the House for practical purposes required the support and discipline of a majority, cemented and unified by common purposes and principles into one party. "To keep administration in gear with the party majority," required a party cabinet, and this cabinet system has been the solution of the difficult and much-contested problem of administration. The cabinet—which should be distinguished from the rest of the ministry, subordinate and ancillary, having only a secondary and derivative share in the higher responsibilities—as a system of government, is perhaps "the most curious formation in the political world of modern times, for its subtlety, its elasticity, and its many-sided diversity of power." It is unknown to statutory law, and although in its idea and functions

now regarded as an essential element of the British constitution, it is not the pre-conceived offspring of philosophic thought, nor the concrete working out of an accepted abstract principle, but a growth, a development, from the silent action of invisible and unperceived forces.

The cabinet may now be considered the seat and centre of the working system of the state, to maintain the executive in the closest relation with the legislature, to govern through the legislature, and to transfer the power and authority of the crown to the House of Commons. "At whatever date," says Morley, "we choose first to see all the decisive marks of that remarkable system which combines unity, steadfastness, and initiation of the executive, with the possession of supreme authority alike over men and measures by the House of Commons, it is certain that it was under Walpole that its ruling principles were first fixed in parliamentary government, and that the cabinet system received the impression that it bears in our own time." The victory of

the Whigs in the elections of 1705 brought the system into pretty clear outline and forced the recognition of two main principles: first, that the chief adviser of the crown chooses his colleagues, and next, that a cabinet depends upon a majority in the House of Commons. A vote of the House declaring want of confidence in the ministry has always sufficed for its displacement. Less than two hundred years ago a sovereign held in person a cabinet and was present at debates in the House of Lords. Since Queen Anne no sovereign has been present at a meeting of the cabinet,* and interference by the crown with legislation would be an infraction of the constitution, eliciting prompt protest if not more decisive proofs of resent. The political action of the monarch is not immediate and direct but mediate and conditional upon the concurrence of constitutional advisers. The ideas and practice of George III, whose will, in reference to the American colo-

*In Spain the Queen Regent habitually presides, once a week, over the council of ministers.

nies and other matters, limited and controlled the action of ministers, would be now regarded as dangerous to the public weal and to the dynasty; in fact, would not be tolerated. In 1783, a message from the King, expressing a strong disapprobation of Fox's East India bill, was circulated among the peers, especially among the lords of the bed-chamber and other members of the royal household, whereupon the House of Commons declared that "to report any opinion or pretended opinion of His Majesty upon any bill or other proceeding depending in either House of Parliament is a high crime and misdemeanor, derogatory to the honor of the crown, a breach of the fundamental privileges of Parliament, and subversive of the constitution of this country." As Mr. Gladstone has declared that in his judgment the cabinet, as a great organ of government, has now found its final shape, attributes, functions and permanent ordering, and as elucidating what is contained in this chapter, it may be recapitulated.

(1.) The cabinet is a unit, as regards the sovereign and as regards the legislature. Its views are laid before the sovereign and before the Parliament, as if they were the views of one man. The first mark of a cabinet, as that institution is now understood, is united and indivisible responsibility.

(2.) The cabinet is answerable immediately to the majority of the House of Commons and ultimately to the electors whose will creates that majority.

(3.) Except under peculiar circumstances the cabinet is selected exclusively from one party.

(4.) The Prime Minister is *primus inter pares*, and occupies a position of exceptional influence and privilege, but has no special function or prerogative under the formal constitution of the office. As chief he has no official rank except that of Privy Councilor. As a minister, like his colleagues, he is administrator of a department, a member of a legislative chamber, and a confidential adviser of the Crown. As chief or premier he is

the leader in the House of Parliament of which he is a member; has many audiences of the sovereign; is the means of communication between the cabinet as a whole and the crown; reports the proceedings of the cabinet, and stands between the sovereign and Parliament. In cabinet meeting, all stand on equal footing, and the head of each department is ordinarily left to do his work in his own way. On business of a certain kind of importance it is his duty freely and voluntarily to call the chief into counsel. With the Foreign Secretary alone, the premier is in close and continuous communication as to the business of the office. The present Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, is the Foreign Secretary. This is not usual, and may concentrate in one person large power in regard to foreign policy. In case of differences between departments the appeal lies to the Prime Minister, and the regular course for a minister who is dissatisfied with his chief's decision is to retire. As a rule the resignation of the first minister dis-

solves the cabinet. Irreconcilable divergencies would probably lead to the resignation of the cabinet, but as a matter of fact and of constitutional principle the Prime Minister is not bound to resign in case of disagreement with his colleagues, and they are bound either to acquiesce or to leave.*

An American reader need not be told that the English cabinet has little analogy to the cabinet of the President, who are simply his advisers and agents and in no sense his colleagues. Between the administration of a President and an administration in England there are hardly enough points of resemblance to justify a comparison. In England the cabinet is the executive, the government, the administration, and on the administration devolves the responsibility of taking the initiative in all important legislation. The Prime Minister is often the leader of the House of Commons, and his func-

* For this account of cabinet government, reference is made to May, Freeman, Amos, Wicks, &c., but special indebtedness is acknowledged to Morley's *Walpole* and Gladstone's *Kin Beyond Sea.*

tions are as well known as those of the Speaker. The opposition may criticise, embarrass, ridicule, denounce, but it hesitates to make a decisive issue, which may involve a defeat of the ministry, unless prepared to assume the responsibility of forming a new government, and of suggesting a policy well defined and different from that antagonized and defeated. In the session of 1866 a motion of Sir R. Knightley on the Franchise Bill, adverse to the government, prevailed. He was unnerved when Mr. Gladstone said he would wait for the production of the scheme.*

---

* In connection with this discussion, the recent resignation of Bismarck, the other great European statesman, is interesting. The *North German Gazette* says:

"The Chancellor did not wish to depart from the cabinet order of 1852 relating to the intercourse between the Prussian ministers and the sovereign, but desired to retain his control and right of co-operation.

"The intercourse between the Emperor and the Secretaries of State is regulated by the law of 1852. It was only within the last few weeks that Bismarck felt it necessary to refer to that regulation. He considered its execution and observance indispensable, and did not wish to be a party to its abrogation. The opposition he encountered in this matter finally brought

Constant references to the English constitution may be misleading to an ordinary American reader. The conception of a constitution, as understood here, is foreign to the English mind. In this country a constitution means an organic law, of higher sanctions and adopted with more formality than statutory law, wrought into shape with some elaborateness of detail, expressed with precision of language and reduced to writing.

---

clearly home to him the necessity for his resignation.

"The cabinet order of September 8, 1852, has always been held by Bismarck as interpreting the Prussian Constitution to mean that the President of the Ministry ought to appoint his own cabinet, choosing men having political opinions and principles in harmony with his own. The Emperor refused this reading, and maintained the right of the monarch to appoint ministers having a direct responsibility, not to the President, but to the crown. The Emperor, in a written communication, explained his views of monarchical prerogatives, his conviction that the Chancellor's claims were an encroachment on the rights of the sovereign, and, finally, his determination to exercise a general and absolute control. About the same time direct overtures to Windthorst and other leading clericals, aiming to take the guidance of negotiations out of Bismarck's hands, produced the climax of the crisis."

The American Colonies laid the first constitutions, constructed on the lines of theoretical science, adopted with solemn form and embodying in systematic, tangible writing what are held to be the inalienable rights of the citizen. The English constitution is a remarkable and somewhat intangible thing, and yet it is living and potential. Frederick Harrison, with some exaggeration, said: "It seldom leaves off at the end of a session of Parliament exactly as it stood at the beginning of it." And yet Gladstone truly said: "It is the most subtle organism which has proceeded from the womb and the long gestation of progressive history." It has been widening and deepening for many centuries. Magna Charta of 1215, the Bill of Rights of 1628, the Habeas Corpus act of 1629, the Act of Settlement of 1701, the Reform Bill of 1832 and subsequent corollary acts, enlarging suffrage and distributing representation, the various acts disestablishing the church in Ireland and breaking down the exclusive privileges of the

Anglican Church, may be pointed out as the great landmarks of constitutional liberty. Besides these there are many usages and guarantees which cannot be found in specific and citable statutes; they are only to be found "expressed tacitly in institutions or scattered up and down in archives and antiquated records." Unlike that of the United States, the English constitution is not compacted into one brief organic law. It is rather the elastic spirit of institutions, the impalpable essence which animates the political forms, controls them, and tends more and more to democratic liberty. What would describe the times of the Stuarts, of William III, of George III even, would be inapplicable in large degree now. It is common to speak of the Three Estates of the Realm as the Queen, the Lords and the Commons, but this is grossly inaccurate. The Queen is not an estate of the realm; in strictness of speech she is not the sovereign. She is the symbol of the nation's unity; the head of the Established Church; the

fountain of titular distinctions; has a moral and social influence, but she has little executive and no legislative nor judicial power. "Her Majesty's Ministers," as an official designation is a fiction, a myth, and has significance only as the ministers of Great Britain. The Three Estates of the Realm are practically obsolete, and Great Britain and Ireland approach the condition when there is but one estate, the people, and one sovereign, the people. It was once legitimate so to speak of the lords, the clergy and the commons as the three estates under the monarch, but that pertains to the historical past. Under existing forms the real chief of the executive power, the most important official personage, is not the Queen, but the Prime Minister; the cabinet wields, with partial exceptions, the powers of the Privy Council, and the one dominant legislative body is the House of Commons, to whose decisions sovereign and House of Lords must, sooner or later, accommodate themselves.

The thoughtful student sees that changes are being effected in institutions, not violently, but more securely than by revolutions. Since 1880 many domestic reforms have been achieved, which have enabled the people to enter upon the enjoyment of wider liberties. Some changes have been wrought which have already produced surprising results. Gladstone, with keen foresight, has recognized that the political centre of gravity is gradually but surely changing. There has been a manifest removal from Parliament, from the House of Commons even, to the public opinion of the electors. What is known in congressional parlance as "a speech for buncombe" has become not infrequent in the House of Commons, and questions are adjourned from that arena to "the stump," the hustings. They are discussed before the people, for it is needful to consult and conciliate those who have the ultimate decision. While the responsibility of the initiative of legislation is with the cabinet, it is in some measure thrown upon the constituencies,

and thus by increase of voters the broadest popular basis for government has been secured. Thus the sum total of forces enlisted in the nation's interest has been augmented and legislators become more keenly alive to the just interests of constituencies. It is one of Gladstone's excellencies, a proof of his progress in politics, of his approach to the American idea of a representative government, that he has almost implicit trust in the "sober, second thought" of the people, in their honest and patriotic purposes, in their willingness, when left free, to do right. Fresh ideas and new men are not contemned and rejected, but are cheerfully considered and impartially judged.

The Jubilee of the Queen's reign made prominent her rule over 240,000,000 of people, over powerful and prosperous states, knitted by easy inter-communication, improving in comforts of life and wealth, advancing in commerce and intelligence. Great Britain has in some respects the most remarkable history and government the world has ever known.

She stands out conspicuous in the maintenance of personal liberty and free institutions, in the origination and securing of those invaluable muniments of freedom which are incorporated into our Federal and State constitutions, in the authorship of constitutional kingship, in the protection of her citizens, in her capacity of colonial government, in her stable and incorruptible judicature, in her conservatism, in her slow but sure acceptance of popular rights, in nearly everything that constitutes a free and powerful nation. To govern this great country is a terrible responsibility, and requires statesmanship of the highest order.

Three times and for twelve years Mr. Gladstone has been Prime Minister, not a mere *locum tenens*, an empty name, but a real *bona fide* minister, as were Walpole and Pitt and Peel. His ministry of 1868–1874 has been called the golden age of Liberalism. The election of 1874, the first general election held under the ballot, showed a popular verdict in favor of

the Conservatives, and Gladstone went to Windsor and tendered to the Queen the resignation of himself and colleagues. This defeat can scarcely be considered a surprise. There had been reform after reform, almost to surfeiture, and each separate measure clashed with some special interest and slighted the *amour propre* of some section or constituency. Besides, the non-conformists, who were the bone and sinew of the Liberal party, were much offended by the Education act. The general election of 1880, including the Midlothian campaign, the most remarkable in the whole history of popular elections in the empire, gave the largest return of Liberal members to the House of Commons that had occurred since the days of the first Reform bill. Mr. Disraeli, now Lord Beaconsfield, surrendered the seals of office. The Queen sent for Lord Granville and the Marquis of Hartington to form a ministry. It is well known that personally she does not like Mr. Gladstone. He is not complaisant and adulatory, and never conceals

from her that which he believes to be the truth. While scrupulously respectful, and bold in protecting her dignity and rightful prerogatives, and shoring up the crown against assailants, he recognizes his true relation, when Prime Minister, to the sovereign, his colleagues, the Parliament and the people, and never yields a hair's breadth in matters of principle and vital to a constitutional government. John Bright, replying to Disraeli, who had talked of his interviews with the Queen with some pompousness, said that "a minister who deceives his sovereign is as guilty as the conspirator who would dethrone her." The noble lords sent for would not undertake the formation of a government, and frankly told Her Majesty that the Prime Minister had been designated by the people. The victory was not only for Liberalism, but for Mr. Gladstone personally, and to have set aside or defeated the voice of the people would have been impolitic and dangerous. Lord Ronald Gower, in his *Reminiscences*, states that Beaconsfield was ex-

tremely displeased that the succession had fallen to Gladstone, and complained of Granville and Hartington as deficient in spirit. This incident has an important constitutional bearing, for the old notion of responsibility of the cabinet to the crown has lost its potency, and is little more than a tradition. The appointment of a new ministry, which falls provisionally and *pro forma* on the sovereign, must be performed "with the aid drawn from authentic manifestations of public opinion," such as are obtained from a general election, or from votes of the House of Commons. In 1834, William IV dismissed the Melbourne government, but to preserve the sovereign's personal immunity from consequences of political acts and to keep him from the front of a great struggle, Sir Robert Peel, in consenting to take Lord Melbourne's office, took on himself, *ex post facto*, the royal responsibility. The rash and arbitrary act of William IV is not likely to be repeated, for it is now settled that while under the conservative fictions

which so abound in English law and institutions the Prime Minister is selected by the crown, the crown is limited in choice to him "who may be designated by the acclamations of a party majority." So, also, in the acceptance of the colleagues who are to constitute the cabinet, the sovereign is limited by the necessity that the new administration shall command the confidence of the House of Commons, and be one with which the chief minister shall be able to carry on efficiently the business of the country.

Mr. Gladstone received from the Queen, thus foiled, the commission to form an administration. To select such persons as will be useful and agreeable in the task of government requires a good deal of accommodation and reciprocal concession. Many elements besides fitness for the particular office or signal capacity must enter into the choice. In the ministry which came into power was an extraordinary array of talent and experience, for it comprised such men as Selborne, Spencer, Argyll, Granville,

Hartington, Harcourt, Childers, Forster, Bright, Chamberlain, Dilke, Fawcett, etc. Gladstone rose far above Walpole's besetting weakness of enduring no really capable colleagues.

CHAPTER V.

The several departments of state present bills in the shape of estimates for expenditure during the approaching year. These money bills for taxing the people must originate in the House of Commons. These estimates having been laid before Parliament, the next step is to consider the manner of providing the money. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is the officer of state who makes proposals on this head, and his annual statement is called "The Budget." It is thus apparent that the Chancellor of the Exchequer superintends the control of the public moneys, and has much to do with the fiscal policy.

Gladstone, beyond any man that ever lived, has accomplished the impossible and squared the circle in finance. He has thrown a halo around the science and brought it, as well as other great

questions of administration, within the popular apprehension.

In 1852, Disraeli brought forward his budget in a speech extending over five hours and a quarter. Gladstone, with fierce energy and a luminousness that admitted no misunderstanding, assailed the policy of the finance minister. "His crushing *expose* of the blunders of the budget was almost ludicrous in its completeness, and it was universally felt that the scheme could not survive his brilliant onslaught." From this debate began that parliamentary duel and political antagonism which lasted until the death of Disraeli, 19th April, 1881. For thirty years these remarkable men were pitted against each other in the public mind, in the House of Commons, in election campaigns, as political rivals, as leaders of opposing parties and principles, without cessation of conflict. The Derby ministry being defeated on the budget resigned. The Earl of Aberdeen succeeding, Gladstone became by universal choice Chancellor of the Exchequer. The

Times said: "The session of 1853 will be forever remarkable as having first fully brought to the attention of the country the financial and parliamentary abilities of Mr. Gladstone." The coalition cabinet of the Earl of Aberdeen having collapsed, Lord Palmerston, in February, 1855, formed a ministry, Gladstone continuing as Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Crimean war developed a wide divergence of views in the cabinet, and Mr. Gladstone withdrew. In 1859, on change of administration, he again became Chancellor of the Exchequer and retained the place under the brief leadership of Earl Russell. In 1873 and in 1880, while premier, he for awhile discharged the duties both of Chancellor of the Exchequer and of Prime Minister, although in ordinary times the labors of either are sufficient to occupy the most vigorous minister; but, as said the *Times*, "whatever may be thought in other respects of Mr. Gladstone's political character, he is acknowledged by universal assent to be the greatest living master of

finance." The duties of the office correspond to those of the Secretary of the Treasury. At the opening of each session, instead of a printed report with elaborate statistical appendixes, the Chancellor of the Exchequer submits a verbal statement of receipts and expenditures, and lays bare the whole policy of the government in references to taxes and revenues. This involves necessarily recommendations as to increasing, reducing or remitting old taxes and levying new ones. It is a discussion of financial policy, criticism on the past, suggestion as to the future, of the relative advantages of different methods and subjects of taxation, the means of reducing the national indebtedness, policy of "protection" or free trade, the entire scope of trade, commerce, currency and finance. The conclusion of the speech in 1853, submitting the proposals of the government, will illustrate the extent and character of the official communication: "It will be admitted that we have not sought to evade the difficulties of the position;

that we have not concealed those difficulties either from ourselves or from others; that we have not attempted to counteract them by narrow or flimsy expedients; that we have prepared plans, which, if you will adopt them, will go some way to close up many vexed financial questions, which, if not now settled, may be attended with public inconvenience, and even with public danger, in future years and under less favorable circumstances; that we have endeavored, in the plans we have now submitted to you, to make the path of our successors not more arduous but more easy; and I may be permitted to add, that while we have sought to do justice to the great labor community of England by furthering their relief from indirect taxation, we have not been guided by any desire to put one class against another. We have felt that we should best maintain our own honor, best meet the views of Parliament, and best promote the interests of the country, by declining to draw any invidious distinction between class and class, by adopting

it to ourselves as a sacred aim to diffuse and distribute the burdens with equal and impartial hand; and we have the consolation of believing that by proposals such as these we contribute, as far as in us lies, not only to develop the material resources of the country, but to knit the various parts of this great nation yet more closely than ever to that throne and to those institutions under which it is our happiness to live."

The first budget was a revelation to the House, the beginning of a new era in parliamentary proceedings. For breadth of conception, perspicuity in exposition of minutest financial details, for grasp and mastery of the subject, for command and use of the fittest words, for flexibility and richness of voice that never flagged nor faltered during the whole five hours, the speech was never before surpassed. Instead of inattention, fatigue and restlessness, the members and auditors listened spellbound. The impression produced was profound and the cheering was enthusiastic and prolonged.

The sentiment of Parliament and of the country was that the finances were in the control of a master mind, and that Turgot, Colbert, Necker, Walpole and Peel had their equal, if not their superior, in Gladstone. Sir Stafford Northcote, a Conservative leader of undoubted purity and ability, said of the analysis of the income tax, "It is almost impossible to condense, so consummate is the skill with which the topics are arranged and presented;" and of the general character of the budget, "We miss in it the caution of the financial plans of Sir Robert Peel, while in its place we meet with a boldness of conception, a love of effect, and a power of producing it, such as we do not find even in the remarkable budget of 1842."

This ministry, not content with letting things remain as they were, conceived bold enterprises. Among them was a remodeling of the customs system, so as to get rid of some of its crudities and inconsistencies, and to reform and modernize it so as to make it conform to less mediæval

and antiquated and more advanced and philosophical views of the economy of finance and commerce. The struggle to accomplish this continued under many varying phases. A few months ago, Mr. Gladstone said: "No other country has struggled, no other country has suffered, so much as we have done in order to attain this great consummation. It tore asunder our political parties; it interrupted the work of legislation; it created ill-will, and sometimes went near the point of endangering peace before we could arrive at the solution of this great controversy. But all that experience gives us a title to rely on our conclusions." In that hard experience, in the years between 1840 and 1862, spent upon fighting out the battle, little else was done. The Commercial Treaty with France in 1860 was one of the most memorable triumphs free trade achieved. By that treaty France virtually removed all prohibitory duties on all staples of British manufacture and reduced duties on English coal and coke, bar and pig-

iron, tools, machinery, yarn, flax and hemp, and England swept away all duties on manufactured goods, and reduced greatly the duties on foreign wines. One of the main authors of that treaty was the "distinguished statesman, philanthropist and economist," Richard Cobden, "not the least among the apostles of free trade." When it was determined to attempt such a commercial agreement, it was as a matter of course that Cobden was invited to conduct the negotiations. It met with opposition in France from Thiers and other protectionists, but Napoleon, by an exercise of imperial will, imposed it upon his subjects. In England it encountered equal resistance. The officials resisted the intrusion into the diplomatic circles of a *parvenu*, who cared little for the mechanical and conventional etiquette, the formal and dilatory customs, of diplomacy, if he could effect a practical and valuable object in a frank, ingenuous and straight-forward way. Then Napoleon himself was not of royal line, and some of his conduct

had created much dislike and distrust. Cobden met with no very cordial help from any member of the government except Mr. Gladstone. Palmerston, while not opposing, did not care much about the treaty, and afterwards spoke of it as a thing rather ridiculous than otherwise. Much of the preliminary arrangement of the scheme was between Cobden and Gladstone, and, according to the testimony of Cobden's biographer, it was Gladstone's clear comprehension of the difficulties which alone rendered possible the success of Cobden's labors. The results of the treaty were a quickly expanding and enormous increase in the trade between the two countries, to the very great advantage and profit of both, and a gradual subsidence of the jealousy and suspicion which had been the source of so much uneasiness and expenditure of money. "Nearly twenty years ago that treaty expired, but although it has expired the legislation that was due to it remains, almost entirely, I believe, and in every particular, untouched. We are

still enjoying, and France is still enjoying," so speaks Mr. Gladstone in May last, "the vast advantages of that measure, which involved on her part a great and bold advance towards a system of free trade. It is a remarkable circumstance, that while the countries round her have been moving in the wrong direction, France, who made this step, has, in the main, maintained her ground."

Macaulay said of Cromwell that never was any ruler so conspicuously born for sovereignty, and so it seems of Gladstone as finance minister. Other budgets of varying importance, showing finest constructive achievements in finance, were presented in 1856, 1859, 1866 and 1880. Some of these encountered embarrassment from the paralyzation of British industry, the arrested commercial progress, which were the natural results of European and American wars. The latter he described as a tempest, "perhaps the wildest that ever devastated a civilized country—a tempest of war, distinguished, indeed, by the exhibition of

the most marvelous and extraordinary qualities of valor, heroism and perseverance." In all these financial statements there was shown the minutest familiarity with all branches of the public industry and the public revenue. There were no exaggerations of resources, no errors of omission, no crowding by excess nor weakening by insufficiency of facts or arguments. While the House would be packed to the doors and through all its approaches, strangers with tickets for gallery would sometimes wait seven or eight hours in St. Stephen's Hall so as to be present at the delivery of one of these orations which threw romance into arithmetical figures and made finance a fine art. Great questions of war or peace, of liberty or religion, have inspired the masterpieces of human eloquence. It remained for Gladstone to make a budget the occasion for entrancing oratory.

As we have seen, Gladstone turned from his early notions of restrictions and rigid protection and gave cordial support to Peel in the great fiscal reforms exe-

cuted during his administration. The revised tariff, introduced into the House in 1842, in which a total abolition, or considerable reduction, of no fewer than 750 out of 1,200 duty-paying articles took place, was largely the work of Gladstone. It is not too much to say that to him is due no inconsiderable credit for the speedy consummation of the free trade policy of the Peel ministry. Under Lord Aberdeen he concurred in the announcement that the mission of the cabinet would be to maintain and extend free trade principles and to continue Peel's commercial and financial system. In his first budget, while conceding the potency of the income tax, as an engine of gigantic power for great national purposes, he said it was not desirable to maintain it as a portion of the permanent and ordinary finances of the country. "Its inequality was a fact important in itself; the inquisition it entailed was a most serious disadvantage; and the frauds to which it led were evils which it was not possible to characterize

in terms too strong." "Whatever you do in regard to the income tax, you must be bold, intelligible, decisive." The government sought to put an end to the uncertainty that prevailed respecting the income tax, and to take effectual measures for marking it as a temporary measure. The wars, entailing heavy and exceptional expenditures, interfered with his desire for the reduction and final remission of the income tax, but he never relaxed his purpose. The difficulties did not make him less constant in his endeavors in the direction of relieving commerce from imposts, and he frequently entered into calculations to show that remission of taxes had always been accompanied by increase of revenue, consequent upon increase of trade. Northcote, in estimating the general result of the financial policy from 1842 to 1861, concluded that the condition of every portion of the community was greatly improved by the new policy.

In the financial statement of 1864, contrasting the strength, stability and

progress of the United Kingdom under the old system of protection with the results under the new system, it is said, "The effect of twenty years of free trade legislation, inaugurated by Sir Robert Peel, and carried on by his successors in office, had been such that concurrently with the repeal of a long catalogue of duties and imposts which had previously fettered manufacturers, and excluded most valuable foreign products, the finances of the country presented an aspect of abundance and stability, almost without precedent in our history, and to which no foreign country could offer a comparison. In point of wealth and national credit indeed, England stood almost alone amongst the nations of the world."

In 1876 Gladstone was convinced that the time had arrived when Parliament should face the subject of the national debt, and he suggested that a good plan of operating on the debt would be by the conversion of perpetual into terminable annuities. The proposal excited little

opposition, but a change of the ministry arrested action. From 1856 to 1890 the national debt was reduced from £808,000,000 to £694,000,000. Financial legislation in the years 1862–1865 gave the country a reduction of taxation to the extent of £2,276,000 annually. In the thirteen years from 1857 to 1878, there was a repeal or reduction of taxes to the amount of £42,816,329, and an increase of £3,080,086, showing a favorable balance of £37,766,263.

It should not be forgotten that during a large portion of the period of Gladstone's fiscal management he was handicapped by uncontrollable adverse causes. From the growing wants of the country it was a time of growing expenditure. A tremulous apprehension, a sense of insecurity, a panicky pessimism, prevailed at times in London and in the rural districts. A battle-of-Dorking fear seized many minds. The army and navy establishments and immense expenditures of the nations on the continent created a sort of feeling that England, although

islanded, must keep pace with these hostile preparations. Exigencies, like the war in China, the conflicts in Africa, the wars in Europe, the diplomatic complications with the United States, made it impracticable to carry out fully the policy of retrenchment and reduced taxation, and gave plausibility to arguments against financial and revenue reforms. Gladstone might have acquired temporary popularity by yielding to alluring temptations, but with fixedness he adhered to his convictions and labored for the well-being of the whole country, of the classes as well as of the masses, of the future as well as of the fleeting present. He warned Parliament against the system of enormous and costly loans, of throwing burdens on posterity, of mortgaging the industry of future generations. Those who made war should bear the sacrifices it entailed, as this would restrain vaulting ambition, the lust of conquest, and incline to early peace. National crises should be met as they arise, and Parliament should not set the pestilent example of abolishing

taxes and borrowing money in their stead. He deprecated the "proneness to constant and almost boundless augmentations of expenditure and the consequences associated with them," and he persistently enforced the duty and the necessity of guarding against extravagance and of reducing expenditures. His constant aim was to lower the public charges, to keep within the estimates, to lessen taxation and the public debt. He affirmed that he would not share in the responsibility of a government which did not, on every occasion, seek to enlarge its resources by a wise economy, and hence, in 1878, he wrote of the great duty, "unfortunately neglected, of preparing by a resolute and steady effort to reduce public burdens, in preparation for a day when we shall probably have less capacity than we now have to bear them." The right and sound principle is to estimate expenditure liberally, to estimate revenue carefully, to make each year pay its own expenses, and to take care that your charge is not greater than

your income. In 1859, he found an empty exchequer, heavy burdens on the nation and a deficit of £5,000,000. In 1861, he reduced the income tax and abolished the paper duty; in 1863, relieved the country of taxes to the amount of £3,340,000; in 1864, of another £3,000,000 of taxes, and in 1866 reached the culminating point of a remission of £5,420,000. In 1874, he handed over the most flourishing revenue ever turned over by a Parliament to its successor and a surplus of £6,000,000.

Gladstone has no sympathy with the assumption on the part of government to regulate industries and direct investments,—an undertaking economically false and otherwise full of perplexity and danger. He thinks it wisest and best for every man to deal with whom and where he pleases, so long as he does not infringe upon the equal right of another. It is a gross perversion of the legitimate functions of government to use the taxing power for other purposes than the raising of money for an eco-

nomical administration. It should never be used to create monopolies, to create special privileges, to discriminate between citizens or classes of citizens, to provide funds for control of elections, to regulate prices, to benefit favored interests or employments. Chiefly through his leadership the customs tariff was so reformed, so nearly abolished, that instead of a tax on 1,200 articles (our tariff comprises 2,172 dutiable articles) more revenue has been obtained from ten or a dozen articles, on which duties are levied strictly to meet fiscal necessities. In one of his recent Midlothian speeches, he says: "About fifty years ago the different trades were in a state of alarm and horror at the changes that were threatened, which they said portended to them absolute ruin. Nothing could be more doleful than their prospects. You know that the result of the abolition of protection has been that, instead of ruin and destruction, the trade of the country has been multiplied about five times over, that the population of the country has

fully doubled, and it has not only doubled in numbers but has been enormously raised in material condition, and I rejoice to think in social, political and moral condition also. Though the national opinion of this country is in favor of free trade, yet we have among us a certain number of people who believe that the injurious effects of protection are chiefly felt by the countries that deal with the protected country. Now, that I believe to be fundamentally a mistake. I do not mean to say that there are not injurious effects, or that there is not a great deal of displacement and disturbance, and what I may call demoralization of trade and inconveniences felt by individuals, and even by classes; but taking a larger view, it is not true that at any time the tariff of any country on earth can interfere seriously with the prosperity of Great Britain or the United Kingdom. * * * The amount of our colonial, our imperial, commerce is £187,000,000 in the year, taking imports and exports of all descriptions of goods together; but

the amount of our foreign commerce is £554,000,000 in the year. Now, gentlemen, I think you will recognize at once that it would be a doubtful—or, rather, not at all a doubtful—policy, a great deal worse than doubtful policy, a most inglorious policy, to clog the action of British energy and enterprise on a market of £554,000,000 in the year, even for the purpose of enlarging our action on a market of one-third portion of the amount."

CHAPTER VI.

Reserving some subjects for separate consideration, there may profitably be grouped some of the more memorable acts of legislation which were matured during Mr. Gladstone's three administrations, or while he was Chancellor of the Exchequer. The spirit with which he serves his country may be gathered from an utterance in one of his Midlothian speeches, when he avows his fond and proud attachment to the "great empire which has committed to it a trust and a function given from Providence as special and remarkable as ever was entrusted to any portion of the family of man. I feel, when I speak of that trust and function, that words fail me; I cannot tell you what I think of the nobleness of the inheritance that has descended upon us, of the sacredness of the duty of maintaining it. It is a part of my being, of my flesh and blood, of

my heart and soul. For those ends I have labored through my youth and manhood till my hairs are grey. In that faith and practice I have lived; in that faith and practice I will die."

In general legislation, Gladstone's policy has been far-seeing, and the welfare of the nation has been his paramount aim. Time has vindicated the reforms he has accomplished, and it is claimed that the initiative of policy, in almost every instance, both legislative and administrative, for fifty years, has been supplied by the Liberal party. The policy which at present governs every department of the state is a part of a legacy left by the Liberal government. Under Gladstone's leadership have been matured such enactments as the Endowed Schools Bill, Habitual Criminals Bill, Ballot Bill, Elementary Education Act, the University Tests Bill, the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, the Trades Unions Bill, the Affirmation Bill, the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, and others of equal importance.

Mr. Chamberlain, in a speech at Birmingham, June 3, 1875, sums up the work of the government of 1880–1885, of which he was a member. "When we came into power everything was changed. There was trouble all over the world. South Africa was in a state of anarchy; there had been war, shortly to be renewed, in Afghanistan; Ireland was dissatisfied, and on the eve of the greatest agitation which has ever convulsed that country since the time of the tithe war; the finances were in hopeless confusion. And yet in spite of all these things, and in spite of obstruction carried with the tacit approval of the Tory party up to the height of a science, and in spite of the most factious opposition that I believe this country has ever known, there has not been a single session that has passed without measures of important reform finding their place in the statute book, without grievances being redressed, and wrongs being remedied. We have abolished flogging in the army; we have suspended the operation of the odious

acts called the Contagious Diseases Acts; we have amended the Game Laws; we have reformed the Burial Laws; we have introduced and carried an Employers' Liability Bill; we have had a Bankruptcy Act, a Patents Act, and a host of secondary measures which together would have formed the stock-in-trade of a Tory government for twenty years at least. And, gentlemen, these are the fringe only, the outside of the more important legislation of our time, the chief elements in which have been the Irish Land Bill and the Reform Bill. The Irish Land Bill alone is a monument of Mr. Gladstone's genius; and he was probably the only man who could have successfully dealt with so gigantic, so complicated, and so difficult a subject. But he has passed two great measures dealing with that subject, giving to the Irish tenant full security of tenure, and now, at all events, he enjoys in its entirety all the improvements which he may make in his holding."

Specific mention will now be made of some measures, and afterwards a larger

discussion will be given of a few more important questions in order to present a better view of Gladstone as a patriot and a statesman.

By an order in council, all entrance appointments to situations in all civil departments of the state, except the Foreign Office and posts requiring professional knowledge, were to be filled by open competition. The half-penny postage for newspapers was instituted, and the half-penny card was introduced in October, 1871. In 1873 there were delivered 76,000,000 postal cards; in 1889, 201,250,000. The royal prerogative which asserted that the General Commanding-in-Chief was the agent of the crown has been abolished, and that distinguished personage and high military officer has been formally declared to be a subordinate of the Minister of War, and therefore responsible to the House of Commons.

In the budget of 1860, Gladstone proposed the abolition of the excise duty on paper. The materials which the duty

affected entered largely into manufactured products, for everything fibrous could be converted into paper, which was extensively used in sixty-nine trades. The duty had closed all the small mills and the manufacture of paper was in the hands of two or three monopolists. It was also proposed to abolish the impressed stamp on newspapers. This ancient system of British finance pressed heavily on journalism. Taxes were imposed on each number of the paper issued, on advertisements, on the paper material. This was practically a tax on the diffusion of intelligence and made the newspaper too costly for general circulation. The government sought to abolish both excise and impost duty and to establish, so far as England was concerned, entire free trade in that commodity. The underlying scheme of Gladstone's reformed financial policy was the reduction of duties on articles of popular consumption, the abolition of protection, and the liberation of trade. Such proposals aroused the "protected" paper

monopolists, the makers of the "silver shrines," and they demanded an import duty on French paper to enable English paper makers to get a higher price than if free importation of paper from France were allowed. The usual cry of interests based upon artificial privileges was raised, that releasing consumers from contribution to private interests meant communism, republicanism, dependence on foreign nations. The Lords rejected the measure after it had passed the House. Then came one of the gravest constitutional crises. Twenty years afterwards, Gladstone said: "I have been through many political struggles, but never one so severe as the struggle to attain to the repeal of the paper duties." The Lords had chosen to assume to themselves the power of dictating to the House of Commons and of saying that the country could not spare such a remission of taxation. The House, on motion of Lord Palmerston, declared, "That the right of granting aids and supplies to the crown is in the Commons alone, as an essential

part of their constitution, and the limitation of all such grants as to matter, manner, measure and time, is only in them." To circumvent the House of Lords and to avert a constitutional conflict between the two Houses, Gladstone included all the chief financial propositions of the budget in one bill instead of dividing them into several distinct bills. This bold course of an "old parliamentary hand" was denounced as an innovation and as "Americanized finance," but a great variety of precedents, showing the combination of different provisions in the same financial measure, was adduced. It was besides insisted that to originate matters of finance was the exclusive right and duty and burden of the House of Commons, and that to divide the function between two distinct and independent bodies would lead to utter confusion.

For many years a practice had prevailed in the British army of the sale of commissions by officers who were tired of the service or wished to compound in

a definite sum the compensation which they would likely receive if they continued in service. The system of purchase was even the subject of regulation and had grown by excess of regulation prices into a flagrant evil. In 1871, the Minister of War, in moving the annual army estimates, proposed the abolition of the purchase system, but accompanied his scheme by a system of retirement and promotion by selection, as well as by the payment of a large sum of money as compensation. After a fixed day no pecuniary interest would be taken by any one in any new commission, but no officer was to suffer loss by the abolition of purchase. First commissions were to be given to the general public by competitive examination, to subalterns of militia regiments after two years' good service, and to non-commissioned officers. Under the old system such favoritism and abuses had grown up that Havelock stated that two fools and three sots had purchased over him. The reform was resisted—when was a reform ever easy?—

and was criticised as a sop to democracy. The object of the government was to sweep away the whole system of purchase and attract the best men into the army. The House of Lords rejected the bill, but Gladstone discovered an unexpected but effectual way out of the difficulty. He advised the Queen to take the decisive step of cancelling the royal warrant under which the purchase was legal. This unusual method was resorted to for simplicity and despatch and the termination of a state of suspense, that the British army should be worthy of the British nation, should have the best men and the best officers, and that the whole position of the officers might be susceptible of improvement whenever it was needed. For this exercise of prerogative the Lords passed a vote of censure, but Gladstone, rejoicing that in a single session a task so formidable had been accomplished, appealed to the public opinion of the country for his exculpation. On the substantial wisdom of the act all are now agreed.

CHAPTER VII.

No struggle for enlargement of popular liberty encountered more active, persistent and virulent opposition than the effort to enlarge suffrage and correct the inequalities of representation. Before 1832 the parliamentary system was an anomaly and a caricature. Sydney Smith said that at the advent of the Edinburgh *Review* it was considered impertinent for a man of less than £2,000 a year to have any opinion at all on important subjects.

The system included, said Gladstone, every variety of franchise from pure nomination by an individual down or up to household suffrage; say from zero to what is deemed infinity. Seventy members were returned by private nomination; ninety by forty-six places under fifty voters each, while towns from 33,000 to 133,000 inhabitants had no representatives. The passage of the Reform Bill of 1832 marked one of the greatest con-

stitutional battles recorded in parliamentary history, because it was a transformation of the electoral arrangements of the United Kingdom. This Magna Charta of British liberties, as it was considered and called, was but the entering wedge, for less than half a million were added to the entire constituency of the three countries. It was defective in that it left the great body of the working classes outside any direct participation in the government. It made the political power of the state the partnership of two great classes, and established a principle which made advance possible, but it disappointed those who found themselves not better off but even worse off as regards the franchise than they had been before.* A further extension forced itself upon the public attention. With the Whigs the principle generally was heartily adopted. The Tories gave a procrastinating repulse or a reluctant assent. In 1851, 1852 and 1853 there were tentative and feeble efforts at reform. In

*See McCarthy's *Epoch of Reform*, chapters II–VI.

1859, in deference to the unmistakable expression of the popular will, the Derby government introduced through Disraeli a scheme resting upon the principle of property joined with population. Gladstone announced that he could not be a party to the disfranchisement of the county freeholders in boroughs, nor to a Reform bill which did not lower the suffrage in boroughs. The Whigs opposed because it did not provide for a greater extension. The government was defeated, and in the new Parliament Lord John Russell introduced a Reform bill which Gladstone supported, but from want of time to pass through both houses during the session it was withdrawn. In 1864 and 1866, inclusive, there was a rapid development of Gladstone's views, and his speeches excited alarm in the Conservative party and corresponding elation in the Reform party. In the great reform debate of the latter year he closed an address with a strong appeal, trusting that the issue would be taken plainly and directly upon the question

whether there is or is not to be an enfranchisement downwards. "We have felt that to carry enfranchisement above the present line was essential to character, to credit, to usefulness; essential to the character and credit not merely of the government, not merely of the political party by which it has the honor to be represented, but of this House and of the successive Parliaments and governments, who all stand pledged with respect to this question of the representation. We cannot consent to look upon this large addition, considerable although it may be, to the political power of the working classes of this country, as if it were an addition fraught with mischief and with danger. * * I believe that these persons whom we ask you to enfranchise ought rather to be welcomed as you would welcome recruits to your army or children to your family. We ask you to give within what you consider to be the just limits of prudence and circumspection, but having once determined those limits, to give with an ungrudging hand. Consider what you

can safely and justly afford to do in admitting new subjects and citizens within the pale of the parliamentary constitution, and do not perform the act as if you were compounding with danger and misfortune. Do it as if you were conferring a boon that will be felt and reciprocated in grateful attachment. Give to these persons new interests in the constitution, new interests which, by the beneficent processes of the law of nature and of Providence, shall beget in them new attachment; for the attachment of the people to the throne, the institutions and the laws under which they live is, after all, more than gold and silver, or more than fleets and armies, at once the strength, the glory and the safety of the land."

Through the defection of the "Adullamites," a name given by Mr. Bright to those of the party who withheld their support from the government, the bill was defeated by a majority of five, amid frantic hurrahs such as had never been heard in the House of Commons. In the course of a year Earl Derby's gov-

ernment found itself compelled to reintroduce the very question of reform whose defeat had been hailed with such intoxication of joy. Immense demonstrations, clamorous for an extension of the franchise, had been held in Hyde Park, and Disraeli, yielding to the popular feeling, brought in his scheme and disclosed it with much fulness. Gladstone, than whom, John Bright said, no one had imported into the reform question so much conviction, zeal, earnestness, courage, eloquence, threw himself heart and soul into the discussion and the perfecting of the measure, and was so conspicuous that the present Prime Minister charged Disraeli with a "political betrayal which has no parallel in our parliamentary annals," and Lord Cranborne, a member of the government, described the bill as the triumph of Gladstone, at whose "dictation" it had been "modified" by the lodger franchise, by a provision to prevent traffic in votes, by the omission of the dual vote and of the taxing franchise, by a fifty per cent. enlargement of the

distribution of seats, by the reduction of the county, the educational and the savings-bank franchises, and by the omission of voting papers. Through the extension of suffrage by this and subsequent bills to householders in towns and counties the total constituency of the kingdom was raised to 2,448,000.

The year 1884 will be memorable among other achievements for the introduction of the Franchise Bill, whereby the base of the parliamentary vote was widened to an extent which would have crazed the pessimists of 1832. Two millions of people were enfranchised, twice as many as had been added since 1867, and more than four times as many as were added in 1832. These acts set the seal on the great change which the Reform Act of Lord Grey inaugurated. "The government of the people by the people, imperfectly recognized as the principle of the first attempt to improve the parliamentary representation, has been at last effectively secured by the two measures which together constitute the great

achievement of Mr. Gladstone's second administration. At last the majority of the nation will be represented by a majority of the House of Commons, and ideas and wants and claims which have been hitherto ignored in legislation will find a voice in Parliament, and will compel the attention of statesmen."* The principal and central idea of the scheme was to give every householder a vote and to unite the three kingdoms in one measure and essentially in one and the same franchise. It provided a service franchise, and thus made a four-fold occupation or householding franchise, including artisans who were neither owners nor tenants, but in a sense householders. Chamberlain declared that "the greatest constitutional reform since the Revolution of 1688 has been carried through. The Tories opposed it, as they have opposed every measure of reform, as long as they have dared, and until they saw the passions of the people were aroused,

*Preface to *The Radical Programme*, by J. Chamberlain, M. P.

so that it would be dangerous to resist any longer. They opposed it and attempted to delay it, attempted to minimize it; and now, with characteristic effrontery, they are taking the credit for the passage of a measure which, if their power had been equal to their will, we should never have seen upon the statute book of the land." The proposition to deal with the artisans as the middle class had been dealt with summoned from their graves all the old terrors and bug-bears; but it was found that the artisan was not a perilous subject, and that he could be safely trusted as a constituent member of the state. No evil effect to the non-laboring class was produced, as for the enlargement of national power it is needful to look to liberty. Talent and character are not limited to the "better born," and the more closely and the more largely the "power of human will, understanding and affections can be placed in association with the main-springs of the state," the more will the vital power be augmented. Opponents regarded the enfranchisement

as an evil, multiplying risks and shocks. Gladstone regarded the admission of more capable men to the franchise as a positive good, broadening downwards, increasing the sum total of forces enlisted in the nation's interest.

Thus, the laws fixed, as conditions under which a man of full age became entitled to vote, a household qualification, an occupation qualification, a service and a lodging qualification, and some others. It was necessary to provide the machinery for the exercise of the franchise and to establish in the case of each individual the possession of the qualifications. The newly enfranchised voters became entitled to be placed on the register and to enjoy this essential process with certainty, simplicity and the smallest possible expenditure of personal labor and of money.

After passing a Franchise bill the passing of a bill for the redistribution of seats, for gathering the electors into well-defined local communities, was a logical duty and necessity. "The strength of the modern

state lies in the representative system." Party policy in districting states and municipalities has corrupted American politics and given rise to a new name—gerrymandering—to designate the new thing. Distribution is always complicated with inherent difficulties, but in Great Britain there had been tolerated anomalies which were in defiance of all justice and sound principle. Theoretically it might be maintained that the population should be divided into districts or numbers, which should draw a proportional representation on a pure population scale; but government is a practical matter, and it has been found better to recognize borough and municipal limits and secure electoral equality as far as was attainable with these local divisions. Again, franchise and distribution were not determinable by the same considerations. Gladstone was of opinion that in a sound measure of redistribution the distinction between town and country, known to electoral law as borough and shire, ought to be maintained.

In pursuits, associations, and in social circumstances, there might be a difference between town and country, between borough and shire, which it was expedient and useful to maintain. He was also disposed to admit that very large and closely-concentrated populations need not have, and perhaps ought not to have, quite so high a proportional share in the representation of the country as rural and dispersed populations, because the actual political power in these concentrated masses is sharper, quicker and more vehement. In his judgment, legislation on the franchise should be followed by a large measure of redistribution. The Conservatives insisted upon joining the two in one bill. A bill for the combined purpose involved defeat of the ministry as had occurred in 1866, and he was not such an "idiot and dolt" as to walk into that trap, and especially in view of the fact that of "the three political crises produced in connection with reform legislation every one has been produced by redistribution and not one by the fran-

chise." The principles of redistribution, or apportionment, were finally agreed on in a very unusual way. Lord Salisbury had got the House of Lords into a difficulty by forcing it into antagonism with the House of Commons on the question of the precedence of redistribution over franchise, and he got out of it by consenting to enter into a friendly agreement with Mr. Gladstone. The country was convulsed by popular agitation; the houses of Parliament had been summoned for an autumn sitting, and had been some time at their work when negotiations were opened between the leaders of the two great parties. Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote, in the deliberations which followed, represented the Conservatives, and Gladstone, Marquis of Hartington and Sir Charles Dilke did that office for the Liberals. The Conservatives were permitted to see the draft scheme of redistribution which a committee, nominated by the cabinet, had drawn up, and suggestions from them were not only accepted but welcomed.

As the result of this conference and understanding the Lords gave way, the Franchise bill became a law, the Redistribution bill was read a second time in the House of Commons, passed through committee in the House of Lords, and Parliament quietly adjourned until February, 1886. From this conciliatory action, this mode of legislation by private contract, came the Franchise, Redistribution and Registration acts. In March, 1867, Salisbury resigned office because the Reform bill, assented to by Disraeli and Derby, was too democratic a measure, a perilous transfer of political power, but these measures made a vastly greater change. The adoption in counties, as well as in the largest and smallest boroughs, of electoral districts, returning one member each, was an arrangement of political power which the country has generally approved. Sir Charles Dilke, on whom the main burden of the redistribution negotiations fell, and to whose knowledge and tact the smooth passage of the Franchise bill was due, in an address before the

London Liberal Club, after Gladstone had made a communication to the Queen of the views of his colleagues and himself, speaking of the question of redistribution as one which lay at the very root of the English politics of the future, and of the large change carried into law, said: "But that change is one the magnitude of which I believe it is impossible to over-estimate. It is impossible to over-state the increased interest in public affairs which it will bring to every portion of our land, the increased opportunities of service to the state, and consequent increase of strength to the state, that it will confer by bringing up the services of new men, by calling into Parliament, in connection with the other reforms that have been passed, men who perhaps but for this would not have come there, and whose services to the state will be of the utmost moment to the state."

Marked as have been the reforms in suffrage and apportionment, abuses in the system of popular representation remain which the Liberal party is pledged

to correct. The principle of Liberalism is that in a wise and just government the greatest number of intelligent and independent men should have an equal share in the administration of the country. The diversity between the actual population in the United Kingdom and the enrolled electors is great. Of 8,000,000 families some two and a half millions are unrepresented, and the enrollment is deceptive, for constituencies are enlarged by duplicated qualifications. Some voters in one place are also voters at other places. Land owners are privileged to vote in respect of ownership of property in places where they do not reside. These plural votes of an absentee class can turn elections. By unfair adjustment of representation in the House of Commons, large masses of voters, or people, are denied their proportionate influence in shaping the national policy. Twenty-three constituencies, with a population of 410,000, return twenty-three members to Parliament, whilst seven others, whose total population is more than 610,000, re-

turn only seven members. The electoral body of the universities consists of 35,000 people and has nine members. The Rt. Hon. Sir G. O. Trevelyan has made very prominent his advocacy of "one man one vote," and the Liberal party, in a Parliament controlled by them, would doubtless demand, in addition, residential suffrage, improved registration, grouping of the smaller constituencies, greater uniformity or equality of electoral districts, and possibly the abolition of the university seats. Mr. Gladstone has indicated as a sample of their practical intentions "a bill to clear away the obstacles which hinder or delay qualified voters from coming upon the register, and to limit, on the register, every single citizen to a single vote."

CHAPTER VIII.

Diplomacy, in modern times, has acquired a new meaning. It no longer, as applied to intercourse between foreign nations, signifies deception, trickery, ambiguous language, a purpose irrespective of means to gain an advantage for one's country. Formerly one associated with a diplomatist secret influence, wily manœuvring, something Machiavellian, Talleyrandish. "Secret service money," which now lingers in our appropriation bills, with some capability of proper uses, is suggestive rather as a relic of back-stairs influence, of ways that are dark and mean. The autonomy and independence of nations, the benefit of reciprocal commercial intercourse, the arts of peace, and other causes, make wars less frequent and treaties open and public. The people as an element in government has transformed diplomacy. In 1735, the royal speech had not one single word

which had to do with the internal condition of England or the daily lives of the people. Non-committal and jejune as are now the speeches from the throne, they must have some relation to home affairs. Family compacts such as, from 1733 on for years, were made for the supremacy of the Bourbons of Versailles and Madrid, are now unknown. In the Holy Alliance and such like engagements, conspiracies of despots against the liberties of mankind, the people were neither ocnsulted nor regarded. Their welfare and the safety of the country were subordinated to the succession of the royal families and the comfort of the courts.

Gladstone, in the various ministries with which he has been connected, has never assumed the portfolio for Foreign Affairs, nor has he been specially distinguished for labors or achievements in this department of statesmanship. Some general principles of action he has announced and acted on. Burke, in his speech on conciliation with America, said: "Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the

truest wisdom; a great empire and little minds go ill together." Not to ignore the honor and interests of other countries in dealings with them has been Gladstone's policy, and he does not believe that the interests of England are so concerned in European struggles and successions as to justify constant interference, large national expenditures and the superfluous shedding of English blood. "Madam," said Walpole to Queen Caroline, boastfully, "there are fifty thousand men slain this year in Europe, and not one Englishman among them." In 1880, when charges were made against Austria conditionally, they were withdrawn, when the conditions were shown not to exist, although such procedure was represented as a national humiliation. It is a melancholy illustration of human depravity that wars are nearly always popular. Unprincipled demagogues have found it conducive to cheap fame to foster national antipathies, inflame sectional hates and fire the public heart by incendiary appeals. "Jingoism" is a tolerably sure

method of bolstering a failing party. Lust for war seems to be an ineradicable national passion. The statesman who dares to stand up in favor of his country's doing justice to a foreign people, to the nation's foe, is sure to be calumniated as wanting in patriotism or courage.

The territory of Transvaal, in South Africa, had been annexed in 1877 by Lord Carnarvon, then at the head of the Colonial Office, on the condition of its being agreeable to the white population, the Boers. The effort to annex the territory, to extinguish freedom, encountered unanimous and belligerent opposition. With a British force on the ground, capable of crushing the people of Transnvaal, the governmet decided that the time of strength was the time to be merciful, and in 1881 arrangements, dictated by honor and policy, were made by Mr. Gladstone to correct the unfortunate blunder, to repair the seeming breach of faith on the part of the previous government, and to restore independence. The acquisition was not expedient because it was

not just. In the same year Greece received additions of territory in Thessaly and Epirus, for which she cherishes the warmest gratitude towards Mr. Gladstone.

A comparison is frequently instituted between Germany's great Chancellor and England's great Commoner. The governments of their respective countries are so different, the personal and mental characteristics of the two men are so unlike, and the condition and needs of Germany and Great Britain so variant, that it is idle speculation as to what one or the other statesman could have done if positions had been reversed. With a sovereign of more force of character or masculinity of mind, with a constitutional government where the military power was subordinate to the civil, Bismarck may not have achieved fame, and with his environments Gladstone would probably have been a failure. Their temperaments and moral make-up are as different as their surroundings. In Bismarck's dealings with Napoleon his unscrupulousness

and contempt for his antagonist shone forth conspicuously. He played with the weaknesses of "the man of destiny," and when ends were attained flung him aside contemptuously. He seems ignorant of or indifferent to moral forces. In diplomacy as formerly practised he is an adept, combining cunning, shrewdness, patience, impudence, and ability to use men and nations against one another. With consummate wisdom he secured an united Germany for the foreseen conflict with France, and afterwards made the triple alliance with Austria and Italy to checkmate Russia and France in coalition. In economical and financial matters, despite his extraordinary genius as a diplomatist and a strategist, he has displayed neither special aptitude nor knowledge.

Instead of a "glory and gun-powder" policy, Gladstone has aimed to establish a general sympathy with orderly and constitutional freedom throughout the whole world as the best security for peace and justice and the best guaranty against

the violence of mad revolution. Intervention in the affairs of continental Europe by force of arms he has discountenanced except as an extreme resort, and has sought rather to accept and work upon the principles which have been described as more peaceful and more just.

CHAPTER IX.

Reference has been made to constitutional crises when the House of Lords set itself, with unyielding adherence to its opinions, against the clearly expressed will of the House of Commons on measures of important governmental policy. By yielding, or by parliamentary or legislative expedients, an undesirable conflict has been evaded. Still the relations of different ministers to the House of Lords indicate clearly the wide divergence of views as to the deference to be shown to the aristocratic and hereditary branch of Parliament. It may be safely stated that if the Liberals were in power there would be an organic change in the House of Peers, so as to deprive it of its hereditary and episcopal character, or make it cease to be a co-ordinate or co-equal legislative body. In one of his late speeches Lord Salisbury said the relations of the two Houses have been se-

verely strained only since Mr. Gladstone's accession to the Premiership. That is probably a fact; but the pertinent question is, To what is the fact due? As late as Walpole's ministry the House of Lords was a more independent body than it has shown itself in late years. Its decay as an effective political institution had begun to set in, and was due in part to the determination of the Prime Minister to rely more upon the representative chamber for the real work of governing the country. The Lords, being generally Tories, naturally have little or no occasion for dissent with a Tory government, and the relative rights of the two chambers are not called in question. When measures of Whig ministers were not acceptable to Tory lords, the Whigs generally yielded, for they were patricians, and, with the exception of Lord John Russell, had little sympathy with the people. With the Whigs the contest was between aristocracy and aristocracy; with Mr. Gladstone the contest has been between the aristocracy and the people, the classes

and the masses. The Whigs had little in common with democracy. Where they gave way, or were less inclined to antagonize the upper House, he has been less yielding and accommodating. He has declined to say that "the legislative action of a majority of the House of Lords has, for the last fifty years, been a benefit or a blessing to the country."

As the great Commoner, refusing the peerage and titles, Gladstone will not consent for the House to be humiliated or relegated to inferiority, or for government measures to be "doctored" or "cooked," by the peers, beyond recognition. In his administrations the power of the House has suffered no diminution, but has been rather increased. While respecting the hereditary elements of the constitution and not at all averse to the inter-mixture of the hereditary principle in the House of Lords, "as wholesome temperaments of the rashness of popular assemblies," yet he has taught the Lords a wholesome lesson that they could not be allowed to defeat legislation which the

country demanded. It has come now to be well settled that the will of the House of Commons is the true and authoritative expression of the national will. "In a representative country where issue has been deliberately joined, the representative chamber ought to prevail and must prevail."

In his address in 1885 to the electors of Midlothian, Mr. Gladstone said: "As respects changes in the House of Lords, by far the best guarantee for the treatment of this important subject is one that can only be supplied by that House itself in the moderation and wisdom of its future conduct. Since 1832, it has been continuously identified with the Tory party in the state, which has obtained the suffrage of the nation in only two out of twelve Parliaments; and few outside that party will maintain that the legislative action of the House of Lords has on the whole been satisfactory. It is likely that if its constitution remain unaltered, the ties of its present party connection will progressively be tight-

ened rather than relaxed. I certainly cannot deny that there is a case sufficient to justify important change. Those who hold with Mr. Burke, as I do, that knowledge and virtue alone have an intrinsic right to govern, might desire to constitute a second chamber strictly on this basis. But we cannot, in the nature of things, exclude other influences, especially the permanent, growing and highly aggressive power of wealth. Among these secondary influences, as a link with the past, as a force congenial to the character and habits of the people, and as a check on other and yet more mixed agencies, I hope, that in the reconstruction of the House of Peers, when it arrives, a reasonable share of power may be allowed, under wise conditions, to the principle of birth."

Of the 474 peerages, 128 pre-existed George III; 173 were created from his accession until that of Victoria; and 173 during the present reign. Pitt, in the course of his administration, bestowed no fewer than 115 titles, including new

creations and elevations from one rank to another. It would be easy to show by citation of measures and votes, that, since the beginning of the present century, the Peers, temporal and spiritual, have set a steady face against civil and religious reforms. As confirming the trend of the caste to Toryism, it may be stated that within recent years thirty-five Liberal peers have become Tories, while only four Tories have become Liberal. Besides a rental from land of £12,838,504, the peers, including Princes of the Blood, are possessed of 3,884 church livings and receive as pay, in the public service or otherwise, £750,000 per annum. Out of 474 peers, 334 are in one way or another in the receipt of public emoluments, and 6,821 of their relatives, from grandmothers to third cousins, are quartered on the public treasury.

CHAPTER X.

The Irish question has long been the *vexata quæstio* in English politics. To simplify or condense it is not easy. It has wide and complex and numerous relations. It has been the *pons asinorum* of ministries. It is protean in shapes. It ramifies indefinitely. Ireland is a paradox. It is claimed that the rules and motives applicable to other peoples cannot be adjusted to the Irish. The North and the South do not harmonize. Catholics and Protestants are like alien races, and develop into Fenians and Orangemen. Landlord and tenant have been irreconcilable enemies. Hates and antipathies rather than friendships and agreements have dominated. Loyalty, law and order, intelligible terms, have been misapplied. Loyalty to the sovereign and imperial patriotism have been the exceptions. Secret leagues have taken the place of open political warfare. White-

boyism, Levellers, Steelboys, Threshers, Ribbonism, etc., have designated factions and lawlessness. Assassination, boycotting, proscription, absenteeism, governmental distrust, oppressive discriminations, coercion, shadowing, have been varying aspects of the mobile kaleidoscope. Religious, educational, social, economic, industrial, political questions have clamored for settlement. Times and opportunities, propitious and promising, have brought forth Dead-sea fruits. Suspicion has marked all alliances and unions. Combinations and coalitions have dissolved without bringing victory. Changes have been rapid and sudden. Fines, imprisonments, banishments, have widened the estrangement. Emigrants, voluntary or forced, have carried with them hostility to England, and even when naturalized in the United States have been rather Irishmen than citizens of their adopted country. Elections in the United States, extradition treaties, diplomatic nominations and confirmations, have been influenced, if not controlled, by

the Irish element, and by the inquiry, How much is the cause in Ireland to be affected by such an action or such a man? Such extravagant demands have sometimes been made, or so impudently and unreasonably pressed, that the ardor of those who may have concurred in the general policy has been sensibly abated. The Marquis of Salisbury, speaking in the House of Lords on the approval of the report of the Parnell commission, said: "The conduct of the Parnellites ought to frighten the country from admitting the possibility of ever confiding to them the rule of Ireland. Here were men whose political objects were systematically pursued by means leading to outrage and murder." Two months later, taking credit for his government, he said: "Social relations are easier, contracts are better kept, the process of setting class against class has become less profitable, and yet political convalescence will not come until the ordinary fidelity to a pledged word becomes more common. He was indifferent as to votes of Irish members, as

they will go against England till the grandson of the youngest living man has descended into his grave."

Besides the intrinsic difficulties in the way of adjusting the Irish problem, the intemperance of the language of the British Premier shows that others more formidable have arisen from tradition, from racial or national prejudice, from a long course of governmental despotism, from the conservatism which resents change even when its justice and right are demonstrated, from the unwillingness to confess personal or national wrong-doing, and from the tenacity with which injustice holds on to its ill-gotten gains. Abuses, the most flagrant, always find able and adroit supporters. Privileges, vested rights, oppressions embodied in statutes and prescription, ensconce themselves behind precedent and usage. How hard it has been to overthrow religious persecution! An establishment, an alliance of church and state, clings to legal sanctions and hoary wrongs, with not an inch-breadth of justice or scripture as a foundation.

Mr. Gladstone has had full experience of varying Irish moods and of the perpetual and difficult crises which Ireland presents to her best friends. He has had alternately the support and the opposition of the Irish and the hostility and the friendship of Parnell and other leaders. In 1881 he condemned Parnell as proclaiming a new and enlarged gospel of plunder; in 1890 he praises Parnell as a wise leader, demanding what England ought to be in haste to concede, and in 1891 he conveyed to the Irish members his belief that the continuance of Mr. Parnell in the leadership was no longer compatible with the success of home rule in the constituencies of Great Britain. In his administration as Premier, at one time he is constrained by severe laws to enforce the maintenance of "those rights of property and of the public peace which are inseparable from the first ideas of freedom, and without which no nation is either worthy to possess freedom or capable of enjoying its blessings;" at another time he denounces the action of the

police in Ireland in wantonly, ruthlessly and wickedly shooting down people lawfully assembled for public discussion, and affirmed that Russia, if remonstrated with by the British Government for shooting down subjects in Siberia without trial and without justice, might find some ground for retaliation and retort by pointing to Ireland.

Delighting in the actual work and business of government, getting into his mind, as by intuition, the details of the most intricate and complicated legislation, it is not surprising that he should have, as he once admitted, a whole catalogue of unfinished work for parliamentary action. Among these questions none has enlisted more of his sympathies and energies than the cause of Ireland with its manifold sufferings. The Irish people, such is the testimony of Cardinal Manning, "have been afflicted by every kind of sorrow, barbarous and refined—all that centuries of warfare of race against race and religion against religion can inflict upon a people has been their inherit-

ance."* Without attempting to unravel the complicated web, it may suffice to present the existing status of affairs and Mr. Gladstone's relations to the problems which are demanding solution. The Vice-President of the Irish Land League, Justin McCarthy, said that Mr. Gladstone was the first English minister to deal on a liberal scale with the perplexing Irish question, and was the first who ever really periled office and popularity to serve the interests of the unhappy country. No English cabinets have ever been more kindly disposed to that restless land than those presided over by Mr. Gladstone, and yet none have, at times, encountered more adverse criticism, more obstinate demands, more persistent discontent and more partisan opposition.

Feeling that Ireland had real grievances in the law of agricultural occupa-

*Lecky, in the last volume of his History, says: "There is no fact in modern history more memorable than the contrast between the complete success with which England has governed her great Eastern Empire, with more than 200,000,000 inhabitants, and her signal failure in governing a neighboring island, which contains at most about 3,000,000 disaffected subjects."

tion, he undertook to remedy, in 1870, an evil of a terribly practical character by the first act which gave any protection to the Irish tenant. The bold attempt was denounced as revolutionary, and provoked the hatred of the landed class. It should be remembered that Ireland is an agricultural country with an area of 20,000,000 acres, a population of about five millions, and 12,000 land owners; 1,942 persons own two-thirds of the land, 744 own nearly one-half, and 600,000 are tenants, mostly mere tenants at will. This tenancy at will has bred idleness, poverty, discontent and crime. The landlordism had a trinity of evils—first, a very unequal division of the proprietorship of the soil; secondly, a scheme of tenancy, short and at will; and thirdly, absenteeism, which meant that the landlord let his estate to a middleman and left the tenant to the tender mercies of that middleman, or he left the management of his estate, with no intervening middleman, to an agent, he himself living abroad, knowing nothing of the con-

dition of his people, and performing none of those kindly offices which are regarded as necessary duties in the position of a landlord. For years land tenure has been the subject of parliamentary inquiry and discussion. Lord Palmerston declared that tenant right was landlord's wrong, and he expressed the current creed of Tory and Whig statesmanship. Some philosophers hold that property has its duties as well as its rights, or, stronger still, that property ought to have no rights inconsistent with the general welfare of the people. Gladstone antagonized the doctrine of the landlord's absolute and unlimited right and conceded a limited ownership on the part of the tenant in the land which he had reclaimed by his labor and cultivated for generations. The time of Parliament in 1881 and 1882 was almost entirely occupied with Irish affairs. A great conspiracy against social order, breaking up well-nigh the foundations of public law, prevailed; but Parliament passed the Irish Land Bill of 1881, giving to the tenant adequate compensa-

tion for improvements and for the loss of his holding in case of unjust, unreasonable or capricious eviction. Froude, no friend of Mr. Gladstone, as late as December 16, 1890, says it was "an extremely necessary and good act, the best that had ever been passed for Ireland." It upset the fundamental principles on which British legislators had previously dealt with land tenure in Ireland, induced the people, for the first time, to place confidence in the courts of justice, and started in the direction of harmony between the people and the law. It made an advanced step in satisfying the demands of the Irish people, and went far in checking the abuses and wholesale evictions of former days. Lord Derby, as early as 1845, in the Peel government, favored compensations for improvements, but proprietary and class influences defeated him. Now, both parties and all governments accept and act on the principle.

The famine revealed the weak points of the Land Act, brought into prominence the discontent of the Irish farmer, gave

occasion for increased activity and boldness on the part of malcontents and conspirators, and necessitated remedial legislation. Gladstone brought in a bill, the salient features of which were free sale of tenant rights, fair rents and fixity of tenure. Free sale meant that a tenant might sell his holding to any purchaser against whom no serious objection could be substantiated. By fair rents was meant rents settled in absence of agreement by competent authority, with a power to either party to require revision at stated periods. Fixity of tenure would make the tenant free from all danger of sudden or unreasonable eviction. Parnell, then in the opposition, commended the spirit and purpose of the grand measure, which was not born of fear or of revenge, but of wise counsel and a patriotic effort to meet a stern exigency.

In the year 1886, the government, with a view to a rapid and easy settlement of the land question, proposed to sanction the use of British credit for the purpose of facilitating the transfer of Irish estates

from the owners to the occupiers, so that they might become proprietors. The repayment of what was to be advanced was certain and unattended with any political difficulty. Its real object was the final settlement of a long standing political quarrel between Great Britain and Ireland, and the contingent demand upon the treasury was one which under other circumstances would have been wholly unjustifiable. The plan was condemned. The verdict of the country, at the subsequent election, was that it was not safe nor allowable to make use of British credit to expedite the purchase of Irish estates. In the election of 1886 the Tories made an emphatic pledge against a recourse to British credit for buying out Irish landlords. They denounced, in vehement and unrestrained language, the employment of imperial credit, but in 1890 they have introduced the Irish Land Purchase bill, employing a sum not exactly ascertained but exceeding £30,000,000, enabling the landlords, in addition to the power of selling in the open mar-

ket, which they have in common with other landlords, to sell when they cannot find a purchaser by means of the powerful instrument which the credit of the British treasury places in their hands. Practically the effect would be to make the tax-payers of Great Britain the landlords of Ireland.

The gravamen of the Irish demand is self-government, the making and administration of their own local laws while they shall still share in the legislation which governs and consolidates the empire. Any one responsible for the conduct of affairs in 1886 was bound to face the constitutional demand which had then, for the first time, been promulgated by the people of Ireland. To that demand there was the answer of resistance and coercion, and coercion has been enacted in violation of former parliamentary usages by the frequent and rigid enforcement of an instrument called "the closure," not "as a necessary and fugitive remedy for the disturbances of the country, but as a part of the permanent

and perpetual law." In its nature and in its object the coercion is unprecedented and odious, because instead of being aimed at crime it is "aimed at restraining and punishing the legitimate combinations of the people to secure what they want by the only means belonging to the condition of their country and such as is secured in England by trades unions and societies."

There was also the answer of a reasonable attempt in accordance with the principles of equality and justice to satisfy the demand. Mr. Gladstone had the courage to consider and face the demand of the Irish nation, which had learned "to adopt the methods of constitutional and parliamentary proceedings instead of the method of irregular and illegal acts." He had come to the solemn conclusion, after a long trial of a contrary policy had proved unavailing, that a new and juster policy must be inaugurated for Ireland. Having removed two of the greatest grievances—disestablishing an alien church and reforming the land

laws—there remained a question more important than both these two, as said Mr. Chamberlain on 3d June, 1885, and that was to give the widest possible self-government to Ireland which is consistent with the maintenance of the integrity of the empire. That system of home rule Morley has well described as "the very system under which the kinsmen of ours across the sea, with all their energy, their self-reliance, their confidence, their hope, are founding new and mighty states in which the English tongue, English freedom, English institutions prevail, and which are bound to the mother country by ties of kinship and of affection, which are, as a great man said one hundred years ago, ties that 'though light as air are stronger than iron.'"

After the election of 1885, Mr. Gladstone, through Mr. Balfour, promised his support to the Conservative leaders if, as seemed probable from Lord Salisbury's speeches and the alliance with the Parnellites, they would endeavor to give to the Irish wider powers of autonomy.

The proposal was not accepted, and when shortly afterwards the government was defeated on the allotment question, Gladstone resumed the premiership, and it was authoritatively announced that he was preparing a Home Rule bill. Then came the secession of the Whigs and a compact body of radicals under the leadership of Hartington, Bright and Chamberlain from the Liberal party. The present Salisbury administration succeeded, losing the Irish, but having the eager support of the dissentients, and local self-government seems a vanishing quantity, unless the next Parliament shall have a majority of Liberals.

Home rule has been much misrepresented, and Gladstone has been fiercely assailed for his willingness to sever the empire by making Ireland independent. His proposal is imperial unity with local autonomy—the establishment by authority of Parliament of a domestic legislature for the control of Irish affairs, both legislative and administrative, under the conditions which may be prescribed by

the act defining Irish as distinct from imperial affairs. There is contemplated only one sovereign—one ultimate executive and legislative head and no breach of union. The statutory Parliament in Ireland is to have, under proper regulations, such extended local government as may remove practical grievances attendant upon centralized administration, and enlarge municipal powers, and accustom to management of internal affairs. Mr. Chamberlain once forcibly said that centralization "throws upon the English Parliament and English officials the duty and burden of supervising every petty detail of Irish local affairs, stifles the national life, destroys the sense of responsibility, keeps the people in ignorance of the duties and functions of government, produces a perpetual feeling of irritation, while it obstructs all necessary legislation." From the cognizance of this legislative body Mr. Gladstone would withdraw everything that relates to the crown, all that belongs to the army and navy, and the entire subject of foreign

and colonial relations. The acknowledgment of local independence would lead to a stronger and closer union. The reliance should be less upon merely written stipulations and more upon those stipulations which are written on the heart and mind of man. The peroration of the speech on moving for leave to introduce a bill for the better government of Ireland is an epitome of his philosophy of politics. "I ask that we should apply to Ireland that happy experience which we have gained in England and in Scotland, where the course of generations has now taught us, not as a dream or a theory, but as practice and as life, that the best and surest foundation we can find to build upon is the foundation afforded by the affections and the convictions and the will of the nation, and it is thus by the decree of the Almighty that we may be enabled to secure at once the social peace, the fame, the power and the permanence of the empire." Absurd as is the accusation that he favors a dismemberment of the empire, a quotation may be made

to illustrate the exalted sentiments of his campaign utterances: "I am very glad that in your address you have thought proper to say that our special purpose, at the present moment, is that we are engaged in a great effort for welding together effectually and permanently the United Kingdom by doing justice to Ireland. That is emphatically and most significantly true. Never cease to bear in mind, and never cease to assert, that we are the true unionists. It is absurd to talk of separation between England and Ireland. Neither the wisdom nor the folly of man is strong enough to separate these countries which the Almighty has joined together. On the real merits of the case we are the only unionists. I affirm that a union written upon parchment, or a union inscribed upon the statute book, is not a full union—is not a happy union. It is but a shred and patch, a figment of a union, unless it is written in the hearts of the people."

To an American, local self-government, as opposed to centralization, is so ob-

vious and has been so thoroughly vindicated in practical action that it is difficult to comprehend the animus or character of the opposition to it. In contradistinction, says Judge Cooley, to those governments whose supervision and control extend to all the objects of government within the territorial limits of the state, the American system is one of complete *decentralization*, the primary and vital idea of which is that local affairs shall be managed by local authorities and general affairs only by the central authority. Mr. Gladstone would gradually enlarge the principle. County councils have been already established, but in his opinion the measure is incomplete until district councils shall be appointed, and, if possible, parochial councils, acquainted with the circumstances of every parish and place in every division of the country, without which the practical purposes of local self-government cannot really be obtained.

Conspicuously favorable consequences have flowed from Gladstone's pacific pol-

icy and trust of the Irish people. In 1885 Chamberlain said: "It is little wonder that the Irish people should regard the castle (in Ireland synonymous with the government) as the embodiment of foreign supremacy. The rulers of the castle are to them foreign in race or in sympathy, or in both. * * * If the object of the government were * * * to give emphasis to the fact that the whole country is under the domination of an alien race, no system could be devised more likely to secure its object than that now in force in Ireland." The people having no part in the administration, no responsibility, it was natural that there should be distrust, alienation from the law and from the administration of justice. They got the idea that argument and reason and common sense were not to be applied in matters where they were concerned, and that justice could be had only by violence or physical power. Now despair is turned into hope and hatred into friendship.

A late address of a Land League says: "Under the forms of so-called consti-

tutional government our nation now is subjected to unexampled oppression and unparalleled injustice; but galling as this treatment is, we bear it with the certain hope that in the distant future your policy of justice and conciliation will prevail, supported as it is by an overwhelming majority of our countrymen at home and abroad, as well as by a vast and increasing proportion of our fellow-subjects in Great Britain. And we hope and pray, sir, that you may be able to see realized, as one of the results of this policy, the true union between England and Ireland which the people of both countries so earnestly desire."

Mr. Parnell, at the banquet given by his colleagues on his forty-fourth birthday—29th June, 1890—held this striking language: "That time has since come about when an English party, a great English party, under the distinguished leadership of Mr. Gladstone, has conceded to Ireland these rights, and has enabled us to enter into an honorable alliance, honorable and beneficial to our country, and honorable

to the great English party—an alliance which I venture to believe will last, and will yield permanent fruit in knitting together Great Britain and Ireland in a true and real union and in a consolidation which will defy time. * * * We believe that when the memory of bitter wrongs in the past has gone by and has been forgotten, when we have been allowed to help ourselves and to remove the bitter poverty and oppression which now weigh upon every Irish project and every Irish enterprise, our people, instead of being a danger to the empire, will be one of its strongest sources of defence. * * * We believe that our first duty is to our country, and we will devote ourselves to that duty, and we shall be rewarded by the knowledge that to us it has been given to take part in the solution, the satisfactory and permanent solution, of the great Irish question, and that we have helped to reconcile two kindred nations and to banish strife and perplexity from the path of a great empire. We shall look to that as our reward."

Sir Charles Russell closes his great speech on the Parnell commission by expressing his opinion as to the removal of baneful misconceptions of the actions, motives and aims of the Irish people and their leaders: "It will soften ancient prejudices; it will hasten the day of true union and of real reconciliation between the people of Ireland and the people of Great Britain, and with the advent of that union and reconciliation will be dispelled, and dispelled for ever, the cloud—the weighty cloud—that has long rested on the history of a noble race and dimmed the glory of a mighty empire."

Patrick Ford has abandoned his policy of revenge against the English race and become an advocate of moral force methods. Davitt has ceased to labor for the independence of Ireland. Agrarian outrages have lessened. The dominant feeling of vindictiveness has been changed into one of friendly responsiveness to the altered views of the British people. Instead of faction and alienation and conspiracy there seems to be growing an

union of mutual good-will among the masses of Ireland and of Great Britain, and a promise of a vigorous nationality, combining for imperialism, for local government, for settlement of the problems of labor and property, for vindication of the inalienable rights of mankind. The words uttered in 1884 by Mr. Gladstone were wise and prophetic: "So long as you continue to pursue a course of justice and liberality towards Ireland, nothing can happen in Ireland which will abate the strength of this mighty empire—nothing which can seriously trouble its imperial action; and under no circumstances can it happen that Ireland can be dissevered in her fate and her fortunes—and it would be the greatest misfortune for her if she could—from Great Britain." Garibaldi, talking to an English friend about the Irish question, said: "Try liberty. Liberty has never yet failed you, and it will not do so with the Irish." John Bright once gave in advice to a young friend: "Whenever you are in doubt take the generous side."

Prior to the adoption of the representative principle in 1830, the principle of coercion had a ready adoption in the House of Commons, and Conservative obstruction resisted demands of the people; but under Liberal ideas and leadership men are now learning that reform is preferable to revolution, and that patience and pacification are better than pistol and powder.

Since the foregoing was sent to the publisher an event of more dignity and importance than a mere episode has occurred, which has changed the status of Irish affairs and threatens a tedious, if not indefinite, postponement of what was on the threshold of early accomplishment.

Charles Stewart Parnell, as the chosen leader of the Irish Parliamentary party, had shown marvelous tact and skill and ability for the delicate and arduous post. He created and then consolidated that party in the House of Commons. He carried through Parliament measures of

great importance to the Irish people. He contributed largely to the forming of an alliance between the Irish and a great English party, and as the result of that unprecedented alliance and the consequent influence of Mr. Gladstone, home rule was on the verge of victory. By parliamentary and constitutional action he drove back and disbanded "the forces of dynamite and murder that had so long been the curse of Ireland," producing such distrust of the capacity of the people for safe and wise local government, diminished agrarian crime, schooled the people to exemplary patience under insults and oppressions and bad government, and taught them the difficult lesson of placing hope and confidence in Great Britain. He had proved his devotion to Ireland by suffering calumny and imprisonment and by passing successfully through the ordeal of a powerful conspiracy, in which the *Times*, backed by at least the sympathy, if not the support, of the government, had sought by forged letters to crush him and his cause.

In course of time, one Mr. O'Shea brought suit for divorce against his wife, and made Parnell co-respondent. The testimony in the case, clear and uncontradicted, showed criminal relations between Parnell and the woman, persevered in schemingly with falsehood and fraud, that left the court no option but to decree a divorce for adultery. This revelation and judicial exposure, not merely of adultery, but of deliberate, continuous conduct impossible to an honorable man, made it impossible for Mr. Gladstone, with the high value he attaches to the character of public men, to continue his intimate official and personal intercourse with one guilty, by self-confession, of the most disgraceful moral obliquities. In a letter, using the most respectful and reserved language, on what public duty made it an obligation to say, he begged Mr. Morley to make known, through Mr. McCarthy, the conclusion at which he had arrived: "It was that, notwithstanding the splendid services rendered by Parnell to his country, his continuance

at present in the leadership would be productive of consequences disastrous in the highest degree to the cause of Ireland. I think I may be warranted in asking you so far to expand the conclusions given above as to add that Parnell's continuance as leader would not only place many hearty and effective friends to the Irish cause in a position of great embarrassment, but would render my retention of the leadership of the Liberal party, based, as it has been, mainly upon the prosecution of the Irish cause, almost a nullity."

In a postscript Mr. Gladstone felt constrained to intimate the possibility of his retiring from the leadership of the Liberal party, as all probability of carrying home rule during his lifetime would have disappeared.

The publication of this letter created an excitement in social life and in politics which convulsed the country. It is creditable to England that the tone, spirit and substance of the letter exalted Mr. Gladstone in the public estimation. The letter was apparently equivalent to his

death warrant, to the overthrow of all his cherished plans, to the defeat of the measures for which he had lived and labored. Men and women of both parties, with rare exceptions, were unstinted in the commendation of a man whose moral convictions dominated party exigencies, and who had rather be right than Prime Minister.

Mr. Parnell, at the first, treated the letter with silence, gave no explanation nor apology, refused to retire from the leadership, but diligently sought a renewal and confirmation of his power. However, some days afterwards, he issued a manifesto to the Irish people. It was written with much ingenuity and ability, and made a breach of confidence which renders it impossible for any self-respecting statesman hereafter to hold confidential relations with him. Even the *Times* says: "The manifesto shivers forever the supposition that Mr. Parnell can ever again be treated as a trustworthy friend or an honorable foe. It is probably the most shameless document Eng-

lish public life has seen since the days of the revolution." In its blind, reckless ambition it does irreparable injury to Ireland in furnishing a point to the gibe that the English people, having seen what manner of men the Parnellites are, will never trust them with the government of Ireland. Mr. Parnell's unsupported statements, so far as they reflected on Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Morley, received prompt and emphatic denial: "The Irish as well as the British public has a right to know whether I admit or deny the accuracy of that recital, and in regard to every one of the four points stated by Mr. Parnell I at once deny it." Mr. Morley was equally explicit in his contradiction.

A schism in the Irish Nationalists has occurred. By a large majority of the Irish members of the House of Commons Mr. Justin McCarthy has been chosen leader. Parnell insists on his right, and with much courage has appealed to the Irish people. The fierce struggle for the supremacy is as yet unsettled. To an

overture of the Irish Parliamentary party Mr. Gladstone made a reply, which is inserted as historic material and as containing the only basis for the co-operation of the Liberal party:

1 CARLTON-GARDENS, *Dec. 5, 1890.*

GENTLEMEN: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter transmitting to me two resolutions of the Irish Parliamentary party.

By the first of these resolutions the subject of our correspondence is entirely detached from connection with the conversation at Hawarden.

In the second I am requested to receive a deputation which, besides stating the views of the party, is to request an intimation of my intentions and those of my colleagues as to certain details connected with the subject of the settlement of the Irish land question and with the control of the Irish constabulary force in the event of the establishment of an Irish Legislature.

As your letter reached me during the early hours of the sitting of the House, I have had the opportunity of learning the views of my

colleagues with regard to such a declaration of intention on two out of the many points which may be regarded as vital to the construction of a good measure of home rule. I may be permitted to remind you, as I mentioned to the deputation this morning, that the question raised by the publication of my letter to Mr. Morley was a question of leadership, and that it is separate from, and has no proper connection with, the subject of home rule. I have arrived at the conclusion that I cannot undertake to make any statement of our intentions on these or any other provisions of a Home Rule bill in connection with a question of the leadership of the Irish party. When the Irish party shall have disposed of this question, which belongs entirely to their own competence, in such a manner as will enable me to renew the former relations, it will be my desire to enter without prejudice into confidential communication such as has heretofore taken place, as occasion may serve, upon all amendment of particulars and suggestion of improvements in any plan for a measure of home rule.

I may venture to assure you that no change has taken place in my desire to press forward

on the first favorable opportunity a just and effective measure of home rule. I recognize and earnestly seek to uphold the independence of the Irish Parliamentary party no less than that of the Liberal party. I acknowledge with satisfaction the harmony which since 1886 has prevailed between them, and when the present difficulty is removed I am aware of no reason to anticipate its interruption. From what has taken place on both sides of the channel in the last four years, I look forward with confidence, as do my colleagues, to the formation and prosecution of a measure which, in meeting all the just claims of Ireland, will likewise obtain the approval of the people of Great Britain.

I shall at all suitable times prize the privilege of free communication with the Irish National party. And I will finally remind you of my declaration this morning that, apart from personal confidence, there is but one guarantee which can be of real value to Ireland. It is that recently pointed out by Sir Wm. Harcourt in his letter of December 2d, when he called attention to "the unquestionable political fact that no party and no leaders could ever propose or hope to carry any

scheme of home rule which had not the cordial concurrence and the support of the Irish nation as declared by their representatives in Parliament."

Since November Mr. Gladstone has persistently refused to have any dealings with Mr. Parnell or to acknowledge him in any way. Mr. McCarthy, having communicated with him with special reference to the settlement of the Irish land question and the final control of the Irish police, received assurances as to what the Liberal party would regard it as their duty to do, and he reported: "It would be obviously inconsistent with the concessions of home rule to Ireland that the power to deal with the laws relating to land in Ireland should be permanently confined to the imperial Parliament—to the exclusion of the Irish Legislature. The land question must therefore either be settled by the imperial Parliament simultaneously with the establishment of home rule or within a limited period thereafter to be specified in the Home Rule Bill, or the power to deal with it

must be committed to the Irish Legislature." To the question of police, the report stated that "Mr. Gladstone expressly said, in introducing the Home Rule Bill in 1886, that he and his colleagues had no desire to exempt the police of Ireland in its final form from ultimate control of the Irish legislative body. The complete organization of the civil force by the Irish Government in order to take the place of the present armed and semi-military police ought not to require more than a moderate amount of time, say five years or less. During that interval the present armed police, under the control of the Lord Lieutenant, would undergo a rapid reduction or a transformation (subject, of course, to a strict observance of all the engagements made by the imperial government with the Royal Irish Constabulary), and would, on the completion of the arrangement for a civil police, finally disappear."

The letters of Mr. Gladstone best illustrate the man. While saving the Liberal party, they show that he is too con-

scientious and devoted to the right to allow party exigencies to dominate moral convictions. They are specimens of "magnanimous and delicate veracity," while marked by courageous and frank avowals as to wishes and purpose.

CHAPTER XI.

LIKE his celebrated rival, Mr. Gladstone has been a writer of books and a frequent contributor to magazines and reviews. So wide are his reading and sympathies, such the variety and plenitude of his intellectual powers and acquisitions, that his writings are numerous and inclusive of a great range of topics. Subjects—historical, political, ecclesiastical, religious, artistic, economic, literary and practical, have engaged his prolific pen. Some books have owed their reputation or circulation to his commendation of them. When he was serving as Lord High Commissioner to arrange the cession of the Ionian Islands, at a banquet in Athens he addressed the assembly in the ancient Greek language, and because of his fluency, pronunciation and accent was declared a great Greek orator. The ability to accomplish this intellectual feat was the result, in some degree, of his Homeric

studies. For many years he has applied himself to the study of Homer. It is his recreation, his passion, and his mind is saturated with the spirit, and his memory is filled with the images and the language, of the Homeric poems. He may not be a Greek scholar of the verbal nicety and critical accuracy of some professors who have given their lives to the grammar of the language, but his *Studies on Homer*, *Juventus Mundi*, *Homeric Synchronism*, and various contributions to the reviews, show a profound acquaintance with the history, the thought, the atmosphere of the period.

In the course of this study frequent reference has been made to, and several quotations taken from, *Church and State* and *Gleanings of Past Years*. No writings have been more read, or have provoked more bitter comment, than those in which he discussed Vaticanism. His high churchism, and his strenuous and successful efforts for the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland, and his courageous purpose to mete out fullest

justice to Roman Catholics, have caused Mr. Gladstone to be charged with drifting toward the Church of Rome, and even with being a pervert to that faith. In some respects that ecclesiastical organization has had no more persistent nor able opponent. Pius IX, resolving to crown his long pontificate by the formal assumption, under the sanction of the collective episcopate of his church, of semi-divine attributes, summoned, in 1870, a council to Rome, which assented to his wishes, and decreed papal infallibility.

In 1874 the public mind in England was much aroused by ritualistic practices in some of the churches of the establishment, by the aggressive activity of the Roman Church, and by the apprehension of an organized and powerful influence for Romanizing Great Britain. This awakened much controversy on church power and papal power. Mr. Gladstone, in an article in *Contemporary Review* on ritualism, used this language: "At no time since the sanguinary reign

of Mary has such a scheme been possible [Romanizing the church and people of England]. But if it had been possible in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, it would still have become impossible in the nineteenth, when Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith; when she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; when no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another; and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history." This courageous attack created much excitement and discussion. During the ecclesiastical warfare which prevailed, he defended his position by a pamphlet on *The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance: a Political Expostulation.* In restating the four distinct propositions included in the foregoing extract, he proceeded to their demonstration with thorough fa-

miliarity with ecclesiastical history, with great boldness, with most careful polemical fairness, but with inexpugnable logic. His contention was that the design of Vaticanism was to disturb civil society and to proceed, when requisite and practicable, to the issue of blood for the accomplishment of its aims; that the hierarchical power aimed, internally, at the total destruction of right, not of right as opposed to wrong, but of right as opposed to arbitrary will, and, externally, it maintained the right and duty of the organized spirituality to override at will, in respect of right and wrong, the entire action of the civil power, and likewise to employ force, as and when it may think fit, for the fulfillment of its purposes, and thus to establish "absolutism of the church and absolutism in the church." The Pope claimed to determine, by spiritual prerogative, questions of the civil sphere, and thus those who acknowledge his authority forfeit mental and moral freedom and place loyalty and civil duty in his hands. "Absolute obedience, it is de-

clared, is due to the Pope at the peril of salvation, not alone in faith, in morals, but in all things which concern the discipline and government of the church." "Duty is a power which rises with us in the morning, goes to rest with us at night. It is co-extensive with the action of our intelligence." Mr. Gladstone thus summed up his conclusions:

"1. That the Pope, authorized by his council, claims for himself the domain (*a*) of faith, (*b*) of morals, and (*c*) of all that concerns the discipline and government of the church.

"2. That he, in like manner, claims the power of determining the limits of those domains.

"3. That he does not sever them, by any acknowledged or intelligible line, from the domains of civil duty and allegiance.

"4. That he therefore claims, and claims from the month of July, 1870, onwards, with plenary authority, from every convert and member of his church that he shall place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of himself."

The angry discussion provoked by the essay on Ritualism was quietude compared with the storm of wrath which the pamphlet evoked. The writer was fiercely and bitterly assailed in many tongues. Replies innumerable poured forth from the press in Europe and the United States. Besides anonymous and editorial strictures, such antagonists as Cardinals Newman and Manning, Monsignor Capel, Bishops Ullathorne, Clifford, Vaughn, etc., and hosts of others made replies. The little book was placed on the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*. The Duc de Decages, on behalf of the government of France, refused to allow the free sale of the translation at the railway book-stalls, on the public highways and in the kiosks. The efforts to restrain the circulation only increased the desire of the public to read. In the course of a few weeks 120,000 copies were sold in England. The circulation in this country was immense, and translations were made into all the European languages. *An Answer to Reproofs and Replies* shows marvelous

dialectical skill and self-control. *A Review of the Speeches of Pope Pius IX* is one of the most trenchant and indignant exposures of papal assumptions to be found in our language. The three papers make Vol. 1524 of the Tauchnitz Collection of British Authors.

CHAPTER XII.

Mr. Gladstone never divorces morals and politics, the civil and the ethical. In public life he is distinguished by moral earnestness, scrupulous conscientiousness, exaltation of character, abstinence from chicanery or mere expediency, and by bringing to the discussion of all questions of government the highest ethical principles. What he calls "the rare, noble, imperial virtue of justice" seems to be his pole star. "It is our desire to be just, but to be just we must be just to all. The oppression of a majority is detestable and odious; the oppression of a minority is only by one degree less odious and detestable." It is not in abstract virtues, nor mere ethical excellencies, nor simply in frankness of speech, ingenuousness of action, moral sensibility, or generous charity, that he has demonstrated their compatibility with civic greatness, but, like Hale and Wilberforce

and Shaftesbury, he is decidedly and consistently a religious man. He accepts Christianity not simply as an intellectual creed, but as a personal belief, operative on human conduct, vitalizing motive, imposing obligations, offering rewards. The moral and spiritual elements may be said to dominate in his life. He writes on religious themes; he constructs apologies for the inspiration of the Scriptures and the evidences of Christianity, breaks a lance with infidels and agnostics, lectures on the righteousness which is by faith in Jesus Christ, and reads the service in his church at Hawarden. He is emphatically a churchman, perhaps a high churchman, and his sectarianism has obviously been a formidable barrier in hindering him from following his political principles to their logical consequences. High churchism is *per se* and concededly exclusive, intolerant of differences, and yet, in spite of early education and ecclesiastical convictions and environments, Mr. Gladstone has succeeded, in no small degree, in breaking

the bonds which fettered him, and has gone very far in the assertion of religious freedom. The high view he took and maintained of the duties and privileges of the Established Church and the claims he has made for Anglicanism naturally awaken surprise that he has, on many questions, acted with non-conformists. It is a marvel that with his convictions and opinions he should have gone so far; it is a greater marvel that he should hesitate to follow his action to legitimate, inevitable results.

In England, religious and political reforms have gone along *pari passu*, and have been retroactive and reproductive. With electoral reform, extension of suffrage and enlargement of popular rights and liberties, have come demands for the removal of restraints upon the free exercise of religion, the abolition of offensive ecclesiastical discriminations, and the equality of all churches or denominations before the law. Mr. Gladstone, as a member and especially as the leader of the Liberal party, has favored, and some-

times fathered, many of the various reforms which in late years have illuminated the statutes of England. He came into public life after the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts (1828) and the Catholic Emancipation Act (1829), but he sustained the Marriage and Registration Acts, which permitted the celebration of marriages and the registration of births, deaths and marriages elsewhere than in connection with the Established Church; the withdrawal of the *Regium Donum*, which left non-conformists free to protest with clean hands against the national endowments of religion; the admission of Jews into Parliament; the removing the disabilities of clergymen who abandoned the clerical profession; Burial law reform, which authorized, both in church-yards and the consecrated portions of cemeteries, burial services other than those of the Established Church; the opening of the grammar schools, whereby children of all denominations were admitted to the endowed schools with liberty of withdrawing from the

religious instruction, and others than members of the Church of England were made capable of acting as trustees of the schools; the Qualification for Offices Act, which abolished the declaration on the part of municipal and other public officers which had been substituted for the previous sacramental test; the Official Attendance at Place of Worship Act, which allowed office-holders to attend religious worship other than that of the Established Church with insignia of office, without incurring forfeiture of office or penalty, and which opened the office of Lord Chancellor of Ireland to persons without reference to religious belief; the nationalization of the universities, whereby scholarships, degrees, fellowships and headships were made eligible to persons of merit without regard to ecclesiastical distinctions, and, as has been explained, the disestablishment of the Irish Church.

The tithe or church rate question has not yet been satisfactorily settled, and is not likely to cease to return to plague the

inventors until the church question of which it is a part is settled. It is the establishment which is the source of discontent, inequality, and injustice. Tranquillity cannot be secured, nor agitation suppressed, so long as one sect is obliged to pay tithes or rates for the support of the clergy of another sect, or so long as government claims the right to impose burdens on the people for the maintenance of a religion. An establishment is a mere human or legal institution, clearly separable from a church, and tithes are an arbitrary tax laid out in paying the wages of a particular class of servants. It is alleged that tithes are the property of the church, and that any interference with the right of the clergy to tithes is founded on a principle of rapine and spoliation. It might as well be claimed that taxes levied for the support of the army are the property of the soldiers. The clergy of a state establishment stand on the same footing, are in the same predicament, as any other class of public functionaries. They are the

servants of the state, paid for the discharge of certain prescribed duties. Mr. Gladstone, in his long public service, has necessarily had to meet this question, and he has, time and again, insisted on bringing the contentious matter to an end, on compromising the law of church rates, which was open to grave objection. In 1868 he brought in a measure, not prohibiting the making of a church rate —one of the avowed objects of the abolition of church rates being to get rid of the union of church and state—but providing that no suit shall be instituted to compel the payment of any church rate made in any parish or place in England or Wales.

A pending measure in Parliament is not for the abolition of tithes, but to change the mode of collection and, to some extent, to transfer the obligation from owner to occupier. The Tories say the tithe is the property of the church and they ought to preserve it for the church. On the other hand, the Liberals say that, whether the church enjoys the

tithe by law or not, the ultimate right to the tithe is vested in the nation. Mr. Gladstone says the subject is a serious impediment in the way of rapid and easy progress with public business, and that the tithe ought not to be thrown away. Being national property it ought to be jealously guarded and preserved.

All these measures are but steps towards the inevitable result. They are inconsequential, incomplete, except as they tend to, prepare for, and hasten the grand consummation. Toleration having been secured, civil disabilities, or the tyranny of incapacitation, having been removed, there remains the demand, as logical and just as the attainment is sure, for religious equality and freedom, and this involves necessarily disestablishment of the church. To this ultimate point Mr. Gladstone has not committed himself. From the positions assumed in his first published work, *The State in its Relations with the Church*, he has largely departed, but has not made up his mind, or at least not made known

his determination, to cross the Rubicon. In 1874 the Archbishop of Canterbury introduced the Public Worship Regulation Bill, so as to give the bishop larger directory power as to worship. The departure of many English clergymen for Rome, and the Romish practices introduced into many churches, had awakened a strong feeling against ritualism and popish practices, as they were called. The bill, passing the House of Lords, came down to the House of Commons, which seemed to be nearly unanimous in its desire to arrest the progress of ritualism. Mr. Gladstone, under much embarrassment, felt constrained to point out what he considered a false issue and to dispel the illusions which the bill had raised. He objected that it interfered with liberty and with the variety of customs which had grown up in different parts of the country, and he enlarged upon the inconveniences of enforcing strict uniformity, and maintained that variations from the rubric ought not to be interfered with. "For example, the

rubric required the catechising of children at the afternoon service; it required the Athanasian creed to be read thirteen times in the year, and it was very doubtful whether the present hymnology of the church was in accordance with the rubric."

In resolutions presented to the House as a wiser basis of legislation he insisted:

"1. That this House cannot do otherwise than take into view the lapse of more than two centuries since the enactment of the present rubrics of the Common Prayer-Book of the Church of England; the multitude of particulars embraced in the conduct of divine service under their provisions; the doubts occasionally attaching to their interpretation, and the number of points they are thought to leave undecided; the diversities of local custom which under these circumstances have long prevailed; and the unreasonableness of proscribing all varieties of opinion and usage among the many thousands of congregations of the church distributed throughout the land.

"2. That this House is therefore reluctant to place in the hands of every single bishop, on the motion of one or of three persons, however defined, greatly increased facilities towards procuring an absolute ruling of many points hitherto left open and reasonably allowing of diversity, and thereby towards the establishment of an inflexible rule of uniformity throughout the land, to the prejudice, in matters indifferent, of the liberty now practically existing."

Sir William Harcourt said of the speech which preceded the resolutions, that they had all been under the wand of the Great Enchanter as he poured forth the wealth of his incomparable eloquence, but the speech could only be described as a powerful plea for universal non-conformity, or optional conformity. In this speech of Gladstone's occurred the well-known tribute to the clergy, whose eloquence and justice will bear repetition :

"The House can do nothing without acknowledging how much we owe to the great mass of the clergy of the Church

of England for their zeal and devotion. For eighteen years I was a servant of a large body of them. My place is now most worthily occupied by another; but I have not forgotten, and never can forget, the many sacrifices they were always ready to make, and the real liberality of mind which upon a thousand occasions they have shown. But even that is a thing totally insignificant in comparison with the work which they are doing. You talk of the observance of the law. Why, sir, every day and night the clergyman of the Church of England, by the spirit he diffuses around him, by the lessons he imparts, lays the nation under a load of obligation to him. The eccentricities of a handful of men can never, therefore, make me forget the illustrious merit of the services done by the mass of the clergy in an age which is beyond all others luxurious and, I fear, selfish and worldly. These are the men who hold up to us a banner on which is written the motto of eternal life, and of the care for things unseen which must re-

main the chief hope of man through all the vicissitudes of his mortal life."

This was the earnest utterance of a sincere churchman. His defence of the church had in it something of the spirit which resented the laying of unholy hands on the ark of God, and yet he discriminates, not, however, on the highest principles by which the relations of the state to a church are to be determined, between a church, "the growth of the history and traditions of the country," and a legal or statutory establishment. In his speech on the Church Patronage of Scotland Bill, he emphatically declared: "I am not an idolater of establishments." In his speech (1863) on the Dissenters' Burial Bill, he said it was an inconsistency and an anomaly, after having properly granted to the entire community the power of professing and practising what form of religion they pleased during life, to say to the relatives of the dead that they should not have the privilege of burying in a church-yard unless they appeared there as members of the Church

of England. As early as 1845, in his speech on the Maynooth Bill, he observed that exclusive support to the Established Church was a doctrine that was being more and more abandoned day by day. In his speech on the disestablishment of the Irish Church he held this language substantially: "The idea of a national establishment of religion, of a solemn appropriation of a part of the commonwealth for conferring upon all who are ready to receive it what we know to be an inestimable benefit—of saving that portion of the inheritance from private selfishness in order to extract from it, if we can, pure and unmixed advantages of the highest order for the population at large, is something so attractive that it must always command the homage of the many. The church establishment, in its theory and in its aim, is beautiful and attractive, and yet what is it but an appropriation of public property—an appropriation of the fruits of labor and of skill—to certain purposes? and unless these purposes are fulfilled that appro-

priation cannot be justified." Twice by vote and speech he opposed Mr. Miall's motion for the disestablishment of the Church of England, which he affirmed "has been from a period shortly after the Christian era, and has never for 1,300 years ceased to be, the church of the country, having been at every period ingrained with the hearts and the feelings of the great mass of the people." Mr. Gladstone holds an established church in a minority to be an anomaly, and is willing, when a decided majority declines to approve or tolerate, to heed their wishes. Hence he is willing to disestablish the church in Wales, and in a powerful speech on the 2d of May last in favor of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Scotch Church, rejected in the House of Commons by the narrow majority of 38, he insisted that the burden of proof lay upon those who maintained the principle of an establishment. In giving a catalogue of possible pleas or reasons by which the maintenance of a religious establishment might be defended,

he said: "An established church must be able, when its position is assailed, to show either that it is performing some special religious work which no other body could perform, or that it testifies to truths which no other religious body could so effectually uphold, or that it is the church of the decided majority, or that it is the church which the majority, whether belonging to it or not, desire to maintain in the position of a national church." This speech elicited from the Lord Advocate the satirical remark that the right honorable gentleman had put an end to the long period of suspense, during which it had been thought possible to keep the peace between Liberalism and good churchism, and that he had ended the period of balanced ambiguity and of cunningly-devised equivocation, and had taken a step which was irrevocable and irretrievable.

On the question of allowing Bradlaugh, an atheist, to take his seat in the House of Commons on a mere affirmation which would bind his conscience,

Mr. Gladstone had his religious sensibilities and convictions brought into conflict with a sense of justice and a controlling constitutional principle. His speech on the Parliamentary Oaths Act Amendment Bill, April 26, 1883, is, perhaps, one of the clearest and fullest expositions he has made of the distinction between religion and civil government. A few extracts may well bring us near the conclusion of this chapter. "The contention that there should be some recognition of the supernatural * * * violates civil freedom to this extent, that in the words of Lord Lyndhurst, there was to be a total divorce between the question of religious differences and the question of civil privilege and power; that there was to be no religious test, no test whatever, applied to a man with respect to the exercise of civil function, except the test of civil capacity and a fulfillment of civil conditions." "I am convinced that on every religious ground, as well as on every political ground, the true and wise course is not to deal out

religious liberty by halves, quarters and fractions, but to deal it out entire, and make no distinctions between man and man on the ground of religious difference from one end of the land to the other." "Truth is the expression of the divine mind, and however little our feeble vision may be able to discern the means by which God may provide for its preservation, we may leave the matter in his hands, and we may be sure that a firm and courageous application of every principle of equity and of justice is the best method we can adopt for the preservation and influence of truth." "Great mischief has been done in many minds through the resistance offered to a man elected by the constituency of Northampton, which a portion of the people believe to be unjust. Where they see the profession of religion and the interests of religion ostensibly associated with what they are deeply convinced is injustice, they are led to questions about religion itself which they see to be associated with injustice. Unbelief attracts

a sympathy which it would not otherwise enjoy, and the upshot is to impair those convictions and that religious faith, the loss of which I believe to be the most inexpressible calamity which can fall either upon a man or a nation."

On January 27th, the House of Commons, no one dissenting, expunged from the Journals the resolution passed June 22, 1880, which refused to Bradlaugh the right of taking his seat by the duplicate procedure of declaring that he could neither swear nor affirm. Mr. Gladstone spoke in favor of the action.

On February 4th, Mr. Gladstone, for the third time in his life and the first time since he became Prime Minister, moved, as a private member, the second reading of a bill. What prompted this action was a desire to remove from the statutes "an anomaly, an injustice and a discredit—a law which discriminated against a creed in the bestowment of positions of trust and emoluments. Roman Catholics are excluded from the offices of Lord Chancellor of Great Britain and

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. Mr. Gladstone would wipe from the laws the last "miserable shred and tatter" of proscription imposing civil disabilities on account of religious opinions. In a speech, conceded to be one of the most masterly he ever delivered, he declared causeless proscription to be persecution. The leader of the House of Commons and the Attorney-General joined in tributes to the great effort, but the government, in true reactionary consistency, having issued a five-line whip, defeated the measure of justice by a majority of thirty-three.

On the 20th of February, Mr. Gladstone spoke in favor of a proposition to disestablish the Church of England in Wales on the ground that the Established Church comprised a small body of the population, and that the non-conformists of Wales were the people of Wales and had spoken again and again in their judgment on the question. The resolution was rejected by a very close division—so close as to give hope of early victory to the friends of religious equality.

The Liberal party comprises, in large degree, the non-conformists, with whom disestablishment is a cardinal principle, a measure involving their self-respect, their equality of rights and privileges as citizens of Great Britain, and, as they firmly hold, the only true interpretation of the New Testament. Their devotion to Mr. Gladstone has been extraordinary, their confidence in his sincerity, integrity, patriotism, statesmanship, unlimited. Their fealty has been tested by patient sacrifices, for they have postponed, at his bidding, a measure vital to them, rather than introduce a disturbing element and seemingly hinder his plans and purposes. In the distribution of offices, Mr. Gladstone has not favored dissenters; in his episcopal appointments he has sorely tried them and the evangelicals. Since Lord Salisbury's entrance upon the office of Premier he has appointed seven bishops simply because they were high churchmen. Not a single low churchman has he appointed. In Gladstone's earlier days he alienated

Protestants from the Liberal party, but in later years his ecclesiastical appointments were more equitable, and he would now not be likely to make one-sided, partisan appointments. In charity commissions, little or no provision for representation of non-conformist views and interests has been made. In the Irish Church disestablishment and other measures, studied effort has been made to strip them of all encouragement to dissenters. As Mr. Gladstone is a high churchman, those who understand what that means of antagonism to non-conformity and dissent may form some idea of the loyalty which has never faltered in its support of the great commoner.

CHAPTER XIII.

By his frank utterances, expressive of his admiration of the people and the institutions of the United States, he has provoked adverse criticism from a portion of the English press. He thinks the Senate of the United States "the most remarkable of all the inventions of modern politics," and the American constitution "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man," and that "its exemption from formal change, though not entire, has certainly proved the sagacity of its constructors and the stubborn strength of the fabric." In the same essay—*Kin Beyond Sea*—speaking of our future, he says, "She will probably become what we are now, the head servant in the great household of the world, the employer of all employed; because her service will be the most and the ablest." In 1856, when the relations between

Great Britain and the United States became considerably strained, in an able speech may be found this sentence: "It appears to me that the two cardinal aims that we ought to keep in view in the discussion of this question are peace and a thoroughly cordial understanding with America for one, the honor and fame of England for the other." In 1884, he wrote: "The convulsion of that country between 1861 and 1865 was perhaps the most frightful which ever assailed a national existence. The efforts which were made on both sides were marked. The exertions by which alone the movement was put down were not only extraordinary; they were what antecedently would have been called impossible, and they were only rendered possible by the fact that they proceeded from a nation where every capable citizen was enfranchised and had a direct and an energetic interest in the well-being and the unity of the state." "No hardier republicanism was generated in New England than in the slave States of the South, which pro-

duced so many of the great statesmen of America." In a conversation with Mr. Gladstone in 1887 he referred to the enormous power and responsibilities of the United States, and suggested that a desideratum was a new unity between our two countries. We had that of race and language, but we needed a moral unity of English-speaking people for the success of freedom. Italy loved freedom, and there were some lovers of it in France, but a moral unity of those using the same tongue would be most powerful for good. His letter to Mr. Smalley will best show his opinions and sentiments:

10 Downing Street, Whitehall,
October 4, 1884.

Dear Mr. Smalley: I was unwilling to answer your letter hastily, and I therefore postponed writing for two or three days, but I find this does not in any degree relieve me from my dilemma. The first point raised by you is, indeed, one that can be briefly disposed of. When I first read in detail the *Life of Washington* I was profoundly impressed with the moral elevation and great-

ness of his character, and I found myself at a loss to name among the statesmen of any age or country many, or possibly any, who could be his rival. In saying this I mean no disparagement to the class of politicians, the men of my own craft and cloth, whom in my own land and my own experience I have found no less worthy than any other men of love and admiration. I could name among them those who seem to me to come near even to him. But I will shut out the last half century from the comparison. I will then say that if, among all the pedestals supplied by history for public characters of extraordinary nobility and purity, I saw one higher than all the rest, and if I were required at a moment's notice to name the fittest occupant for it, I think my choice, at any time during the last forty-five years, would have lighted, and it would now light, upon Washington. The other subject is one on which I hardly like to touch in a few lines; for the prospect it opens to me is as vast as it is diversified, and it is so interesting as to be almost overwhelming. Mr. Barham Zincke, no incompetent calculator, reckons that the English-speaking peoples of the world an hundred years hence will probably count a thousand millions.

Some French author, whose name I unfortunately forget, in a recent estimate places them somewhat lower—at what precise figure I do not recollect, but it is like 600 or 800 millions. A century back I suppose they were not much, if at all, beyond fifteen millions; I also suppose we may now take them at an hundred. These calculations are not so visionary as they may seem to some; they rest upon a rather wide induction, while the best thing they can pretend to is rough approximation. But, as I recollect, it was either Imlay, or one of those with whom the name of that creature is associated, that computed, a century back, the probable population of the American Union at this date, and placed it very nearly at the point where it now stands. What a prospect is that of very many hundreds of millions of people, certainly among the most manful and energetic in the world, occupying one great continent—I may almost say two—and other islands and territories not easy to be counted, with these islands at their head, the most historic in the world; in contact, by a vast commerce, with all mankind, and perhaps still united in kindly political association with some more hundreds of millions fitted for no mean destiny; united al-

most absolutely in blood and language, and very largely in religion, laws, and institutions. If anticipations such as these are to be realized in any considerable degree, the prospect is at once majestic, inspiring, and consolatory. The subject is full of meaning and of power—of so much meaning that the pupil of the eye requires time to let in such a flood of light. I shall not attempt, after thus sketching it, to expound it. It would be as absurd as if a box-keeper at a theatre, when letting in a party, should attempt to expound the piece. I hope that some person more competent and less engaged than myself will give this subject the study it deserves, taking his stand on the facts of the last century, and the promise, *valeat quantum*, of the coming one. I cannot but think as well as hope that a good understanding, in the future near and far, among English-speaking peoples, though it may not be matter of certainty, yet is beyond the necessity of going a-begging, so to speak, for recommendations from any individual, earnestly and with my whole heart as I, for one, should recommend it. Clearly, if the English-speaking peoples shall then be anything like what we have now been supposing, and if there

shall not be a good understanding among them, there will have been a base desertion of an easy duty, a *gran rifiuto*, such as might stir another Dante to denounce it, a renunciation of the noblest, the most beneficial, the most peaceful primacy ever presented to the heart and understanding of man. On the other hand, great as it would be, it would demand no propaganda, no superlative ingenuity or effort; it ought to be an orderly and natural growth, requiring only that you should be reasonably true and loyal to your traditions, and we to ours. To gain it will need no preterhuman strength or wisdom; to miss it will require some portentous degeneracy. Even were it a day dream it would be an improving one, loftier and better than that which prompted the verse

> **"Super et Garamantas et Indos**
> **Proferet imperium; jacet extra sidera telius,**
> **Extra anni solisque vias,"**

because it implies no strife or bloodshed, and is full only of the moral elements of strength.

Believe me very faithfully yours,

W. E. Gladstone.

The English or Anglo-Saxon race is essentially the same in its more distin-

guishing characteristics. Unity of language creates unity of thought, of literature, and largely unity of civilization and of institutions. It facilitates social and commercial intercourse, and must produce still more marked political phenomena. We profit naturally by inventions, by discoveries, by constitutional struggles, by civil and religious achievements, by lessons of tradition, by landmarks of usage and prescription. Magna Charta, Petition of Right, Habeas Corpus, what O'Connell even called the "glorious Revolution of 1688," are as much American as English. England claims to have originated the representative system six hundred years ago. Our ancestors brought to this soil, "singularly suited for their growth, all that was democratic in the policy of England and all that was Protestant in her religion." Our revolution, like that of 1688, was in the main a vindication of liberties inherited. In freedom of religion, in local self-government, and somewhat in state autonomy, our forefathers constructed for them-

selves; but nearly all the personal guarantees, of which we so much boast on our national anniversaries, were borrowed from the mother country.

On the 27th of July, 1866, the Atlantic cable was first laid between Great Britain and Ireland and the United States. The Queen congratulated the President upon the completion of the international work, and expressed the hope that the electric cable would prove an additional link between nations whose friendship was founded on their common interests and reciprocal esteem. Every true philanthropist must re-echo the royal wish. Between a country whose annals are illustrated by the highest achievements of human genius, whose career is such a cheering exhibition of the advance of human freedom and stable government, whose laws and literature are so much the same as ours—between such a country and people and ours there should be the most cordial alliance. The old notions of international enmity, looking upon foreign nations as hostile, are unworthy

of young and Christian America. To cultivate peace and concord and amity, co-operation and brotherhood, is our special duty. Both speak our noble English tongue in its freedom, its dignity, its massive simplicity, and have the richest, purest, most varied literature the world is blessed with. Both "tolerate opinion, with only a reserve on behalf of decency, and desire to confine coercion to the province of action, and to leave thought, as such, entirely free"; both are guardians of trial by jury and of an unmolested home; both have the common law, an independent judiciary, universal education, equality of citizenship before the law, an unchained English Bible; both are asylums for the oppressed, refuges for the weary. In both every citizen can aspire to the highest offices, royalty only excepted. Both whiten every sea with their flags, are daring, enterprising, adventurous; both have carried Christianity to the uttermost ends of the earth; both are set for the defence of a pure gospel and of the unshared authority of

the inspired Scriptures, and for the largest individual liberty compatible with the public good. No pedigree of royal house is co-eval with the English Government. Names, which carry us behind the mediæval ages and into the twilight of authentic secular history, were unknown when the foundations of the grand old structure were laid. Before Peter the Hermit preached his first unholy crusade for the recovery of Jerusalem, while the Saracens were in Spain, before our modern English became a spoken or written tongue, before the invention of paper or movable types, before Columbus attempted the perilous passage of the Atlantic, and when South Africa spread out on the maps an undefined continent; long before Luther resisted the sale of indulgences, or the Bible had been translated into modern languages, the English Government had its beginning; and far, far distant be the day when a New Zealander, from a broken arch of the London bridge, shall be sketching the ruins of Westminster.

CHAPTER XIV.

The greatest living champion of justice and right, of honor and freedom, of peace and good-will, the greatest commoner of the century, the Grand Old Man, does not owe his reputation, popularity and influence to adventitious circumstances. His is a unique personality which makes him the mightiest force in English politics. Satirized, lampooned, caricatured, abused, hated, he is, nevertheless, the most popular man in the empire—respected, honored, admired, loved. Sir Charles Dilke, in 1886, speaking of this foremost English minister and statesman, said: "Mr. Gladstone, I believe, is popular in this country at the present time as never minister was popular before. He was popular as leader of the party on a former occasion, but his popularity, though great as compared with the popularity of other ministers, fell far short of the popularity enjoyed by him

at the present time. The people of this country, amid all the vilification that has been heaped upon his head, recognize in that man the greatest orator and most illustrious genius who has ever served his country, and they do not intend that any amount of vilification or abuse shall cause them to have anything but an enhanced opinion of him."

In January, 1875, he announced his retirement from the leadership of the Liberal party, as he needed slackened activity and physical repose. It soon became evident that he must resume his old position, for which there was no rival, nor could he, unless, with his surrender of leadership, he stripped himself of the popular devotion, of his knowledge, experience, force of character and vast accomplishments. There is something apart from his vast and ready information, his versatility of intellect, his administrative genius, his entrancing eloquence, which has given and enabled him to retain such a hold upon the popular mind and heart. The people love and

follow because they have unquestioning and unstinted confidence in his sincerity and integrity, his want of self-seeking, his disinterestedness. No statesman rivals him in his capacity for awakening popular enthusiasm without appealing to passion or prejudice. He dares to array himself against the demands of the hour, to stand up, if alone, for the right and the just and the enduring, and yet the people cling because they admire his political sagacity and trust his popular sympathies and unswerving rectitude. The adherence of non-conformists to him has been already cited as a political phenomenon. The attachment of the middle classes is equally as remarkable. Scholars, scientists, authors, preachers, and not a few of the aristocracy, bear for him not merely party fealty, but strong personal affection. Indignation, satire, crushing ridicule, are at his command, but he never lets personal animosity or the injustice of his adversaries control his public conduct, nor betray him into abuse or the vulgar arts of the demagogue. Of-

fensive rudeness of enemies, abuse, contumelious insolence, vilification, resort to despicable modes of party or parliamentary warfare, never shake him from propriety, nor lessen the endearment which makes his public spirit and force of will the motive power in English affairs. Some one has said: "He moralizes finance and commerce and institutionalizes ethics and faith." Recognizing the principle of brotherhood and of equality and independence among nations, he uttered this rule of international law: "When we are asking for the maintenance of the rights which belong to our fellow-subjects resident in Greece, let us do as we would be done by, and let us pay all the respect to a feeble state, and to the infancy of free institutions, which we should desire and should expect from others towards their maturity and their strength."

His exceptional ascendency is due to both mental and moral qualities. Earnestness and veraciousness pervade his whole life; he loves the causes which he

espouses, and enters with heartiest sympathy into what will better the moral, social and industrial condition of the people. With keen sensitiveness he responds to the emotions and interests of his fellow-countrymen. When the Queen offered him an earldom—the same rank as that to which his illustrious rival, Disraeli, was raised in 1876—he declined to merge his name into an insignificant territorial title, preferring not to put himself out of sympathy with those from whom he gets his true patent of nobility.

The derided phrase, "The classes against the masses," was not a mere battle cry. It embodied a policy and a principle. Gladstone is a democratic statesman, and knows that the poorest can appreciate, and will be benefited by, traveling at a penny per mile, or sending for a penny a letter from one end of the country to the other. In 1861 his enemies charged him with laying new imposts to burden the rich, and with reducing duties for the exclusive benefit of the poor. In his first election address, in

1832, occurs this language: "There should be a sedulous and special attention to the interests of the poor, founded upon the rule that those who are least able to take care of themselves should be most regarded by others. Particularly it is a duty to endeavor, by every means, that *labor may receive adequate remuneration*, which, unhappily, among several classes of our fellow-countrymen is not now the case. Whatever measures, therefore—whether by correction of the Poor laws, allotment of cottage grounds or otherwise—tend to promote this object, I deem entitled to the warmest support." In the Neapolitan episode, it was oppressed humanity that enlisted his pen and influence and called out the indignant protest and exposure. The charges had no connection with any separate object or interest of England, but appertained to individual and domestic happiness, to the maintenance of public order, "to the sphere of humanity at large." In the conversation held with him in 1887, already adverted to, he gave this explana-

tion of his change to Liberalism, of his friendship for enlarged liberty: "Forty years ago I was ordered to Italy for my health. While there my attention was directed to the state of the prisons under Bomba. In them I found noble patriots imprisoned without trial and for no other offence than dislike of the King's government I conversed with them, as far as I could made an impartial examination, and what I saw and heard opened my eyes and began my education of cosmopolitanism." In one of the annual budgets is this sentence: "Whatever taxes we remove, we will not impose more duties upon the tea and sugar, which are consumed by every laboring man." The Post-office Savings Bank Bill he introduced in 1861 to give increased facilities for the deposit of small savings. The several thousand post-offices would be open every day in the week and for ten hours each day, and depositors have increased from 178,495 in 1862 to 3,333,675 in 1884. His law relating to the purchase of government annuities through

the medium of savings banks, and to enable the granting of life insurances by the government, was conceived in the interest of the working classes, has been singularly successful, and is generally acknowledged as a valuable legislative reform. The same is true of abolition of purchase in the army, opening offices to competitive examinations, reducing the price of bread, and establishing the sound economic principle of buying where you can buy cheapest and selling where you can sell highest.

Because of these and other marvelous successes the thoughtfulest men of England have borne such concurrent testimony as is here adduced. John Stuart Mill said: "If there ever was a statesman in whom the spirit of improvement is incarnate, of whose career as a minister the characteristic feature has been to seek out things which required or admitted of improvement, instead of waiting to be compelled or even solicited to do it, that honor belongs to the late Chancellor of

the Exchequer and leader of the House of Commons."

On June 3, 1885, a not less competent witness, Mr. Chamberlain, said: "But standing here as I do at the turning of the ways, I will venture to assert that when the history of the last five years comes to be written, neither the government, of which I have the honor to be a member, nor the Parliament which was returned to power with such tremendous enthusiasm five years ago will have any cause to fear its verdict. When that history comes to be written, you know whose will be the central and the prominent figure. You know that Mr. Gladstone will stand out before posterity as the greatest man of his time—remarkable not only for his extraordinary eloquence, for his great ability, for his steadfastness of purpose, for his constructive skill, but more, perhaps, than all these, for his personal character and for the high tone that he has introduced into our political and public life. I sometimes think that great men are like great mountains, and

that we don't appreciate their magnitude while we are still close to them. You have to go to a distance to see which peak it is that towers above its fellows; and it may be that we shall have to put between us and Mr. Gladstone a space of time before we shall know how much greater he has been than any of his competitors for fame and power. I am certain that justice will be done to him in the future, and I am not less certain that there will be a signal condemnation of the men who, moved by motives of party spite, in their eagerness for office, have not hesitated to load with insult and indignity the greatest statesman of our time; who have not allowed even his age, which should have commanded their reverence, or his experience, which entitles him to their respect, or his high personal character, or his long services to his Queen and to his country, to shield him from the vulgar affronts and the lying accusations of which he has nightly been made the subject in the House of Commons. He, with his great magnanimity,

can afford to forget and forgive these things."

John Morley, in a public speech at Rochdale, April 23, 1890, thus expressed his opinion: "They talk of their sacrifices. Ah! what sacrifices has anybody made—of friends, of office—what sacrifices compared with that which this veteran in public causes and in popularity has made? No, gentlemen, I said to you it had been my fortune to know some great men, but the greatest man I have ever known is still alive."

Mr. Froude, in his late biography of Lord Beaconsfield, tests his claims to greatness of the highest rank by observing—first, that he has left behind him nothing of permanent value to mankind; secondly, that he never forgot himself in his work; and, thirdly, that his character was not quite an English character. Tried by these exacting tests, Mr. Gladstone may be placed in the foremost rank. His whole career has been marked by a self-forgetfulness in his labors for the mental, moral and social and po-

litical elevation of the people; by such thoroughness, as, despite his cosmopolitan sympathies, to make him, flesh and blood, mind and spirit, essentially English; and by leaving on nearly every page of the English statute-books for the last fifty years the enduring evidences of a beneficent statesmanship.

To a high-born lady railing at Mr. Gladstone, John Bright suddenly turned and said: "Has your son [he was standing beside them] ever seen Mr. Gladstone?" "No" was the surprised answer. "Then take him at once to see the greatest Englishman he is ever likely to look upon."

The common opinion that old age makes men timid and conservative finds no verification in the case of Mr. Gladstone. Each year finds him at its end bolder, more progressive, more radical, more trustful of the people, more confident in the expediency of the just, the true and the right. While some men have their faith and hope and energies cramped or clouded as they grow old,

his political principles grow and expand with the times. With more than fifty years of official experience, he is the leader of a party of progress, and looks with no disfavor or pessimism upon enlargement of popular rights or new tests of the power and virtue of representative institutions. With his conceded intellectual superiority, he is readily receptive of new ideas, open to the lessons of experience and the suggestions of common sense—"equally free from regret for the past and dread of the future."

His life has been full and active; he has been no recluse, nor has he confined himself to politics. In every movement of his times he has been a participant, in social, religious, artistic, horticultural, scientific, archæological, literary, philosophical, charitable. An untiring student, a rapid and omnivorous reader, a conscientious and painstaking investigator of every subject and question that may require from him consideration or action, he is approachable, affable, sociable, and has a large circle of acquaint-

ances and friends. His extraordinary capacity for work is the result of industry, habit, health, method, economy, which takes care of the odds and ends of time. The instinct of order runs through all his work, and his system is so thorough that he gets the maximum of work out of his secretaries and co-laborers. His industry is unflagging. When he visited the Paris Exposition he saw everything, seemed to be doing nothing but enjoying himself, and yet found time to write a long article on Italy and the Triple Alliance. When he last went to Italy for quiet rest and recuperation, he found time for social engagements and speeches in Italian, exhausted two large trunkfuls of books he carried from England, wrote a review of an Italian book and a magazine article, before he returned.

His memory and power of acquisition are prodigious, and he speaks and writes with fluency. As an orator, he is more accomplished than as a writer. His voice is clear, rich, flexible, sonorous and at his

command. He thinks on his legs,has a rare faculty of adaptedness to his audience, abounds in felicitous illustration, rarely indulges in humor, pours out in exhaustless abundance long sentences, and sometimes when thoroughly aroused rises to lofty eloquence and bears onward his auditory by a resistless flood. His vacations he generally spends with his family at Hawarden, near Chester, where he entertains much company. A friend, several times his guest, informs me that he opens his letters and catalogues his correspondence for himself at an early hour. Near nine o'clock, accompanied by his wife, he attends morning worship at the church, sometimes reading the service; about ten, breakfasts, lingering at the table and talking for an hour; then repairs to his library, leaving it only for luncheon; later in the afternoon he walks for an hour, and happy is the person who shares with him this exercise. Returning, he lays aside coat and waistcoat and uses his axe in felling a tree or cutting up one previously felled; thence to din-

ner, and afterwards to drawing-room until about eleven, when he retires, and he has the gift to sleep at will and sleep soundly. He is an accomplished player on the piano, is fond of Scotch airs and ballad music, and after exciting debate or heavy official duties returns home and solaces his overtaxed brain by playing such music as secures repose and comfort.

2508

CIN'TI
6-5.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 021 434 472 5